

village early that morning, threatening to shoot him if food was not ready for them when they returned the following night. A "reaction force" was dispatched when he contacted the Division headquarters, and the village went undisturbed.

The Americans have not fallen into the trap of giveaway programs in the highlands. Aid is sent upon a request, and is on the self-help basis in practice as well as theory. Village chiefs in a given sector are transported to a central village weekly for a "bitch" session with the Vietnamese or Montagnard sector chief and an American representative. Needs are assessed, disagreements are ironed out, and the chiefs end the meeting with a warm glow of rice wine and American beer.

Rice wine is a rancid drink by American taste standards, but the entire team I was with braced itself and drank heartily. One does not offend a friend.

I selected villages to visit at random, and in every one, projects were going on, greetings were polite and friendly, a meeting of friends who know and trust each other. In one village, a celebration over the dead was taking place, which I was permitted to watch.

The Montagnard country is the best in Vietnam. Unlike the hot lowlands, it can grow nearly any vegetable or fruit, and cattle, pigs, and water buffalo abound on the lush forage. The potential for wealth for the Montagnards is there, but with a great many ifs; if the VC are defeated, if the Saigon government deals fairly with the tribesmen (anything else will mean war), if they are not cheated out of their land, and if the people are provided with the needed skill and technical knowledge, as well as fertilizers and power to enable them to utilize the potential that lies in the land.

Lithuanians Day Proclamation

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter and a copy of the resolutions issued on acknowledging the valiant work of the Lithuanians of my district:

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The month of February is a sacred month for all the Lithuanians in the world. On February 16, 1918 Lithuania regained its freedom and restored its independence. Since 1940 Lithuania is under the yoke of Russian dictatorship.

This year the Lithuanians living in the free world commemorated the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

I am very thankful to you for the kind words you said at U.S. Congress and for the understanding of Lithuanians struggle for freedom.

You should feel free that all Lithuanians are with you, especially the Lithuanians on Long Island. I think that it would be proper at this time to inform you about the activity and the accomplishments of the Lithuanian-Americans living on Long Island.

Nassau County Executive Mr. Eugene H. Nickerson issued a proclamation declaring February 16 the Lithuanian Independence Day and raised the Lithuanian flag at County Executive Building in Mineola, N.Y.

Suffolk County Executive Mr. H. Lee Dennison through his proclamation declared February 18-24 the Lithuanian Independence Week and raised the Lithuanian flag to be flown during this entire week at his office building in Riverhead, N.Y.

Town of Oyster Bay Supervisor Mr. Michael N. Petito through his proclamation declared the Lithuanian Independence Week February 15 to 22 and raised the Lithuanian flag at the Town Hall in Oyster Bay, N.Y.

The Bethpage Tribune in its issues of Feb. 15 and 22nd commemorated the Lithuanian's Independence by publishing front page articles about Lithuania and its struggle for freedom.

Long Island's largest radio station WHLI carried a special program about the Lithuania on February 17 at 2:45 p.m.

The Lithuanian-American Community of Great Neck, N.Y. commemorated the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's Independence on February 22nd at Veterans Memorial Hall in Great Neck, N.Y. with guest speakers and with a special program prepared for this occasion.

Enclosed you will find the copies of the proclamations which were published in the Lithuanian weekly "Darbininkas." Also I am enclosing the issue of Bethpage Tribune with articles about Lithuania.

I would be very pleased if you could make possible to record this activity of Lithuanian-American Community on Long Island in U.S. Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

KESTUTIS K. MIKLAS,

Member of the Supreme Council of the
Lithuanian-American Community of
USA.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISOR, TOWN OF OYSTER
BAY—PROCLAMATION

Whereas: on February 16, 1968, we observe the fiftieth anniversary of the restoration of independence in the Republic of Lithuania, a day which is cherished not only by Lithuanians but by all peoples who have fought for self-determination, and

Whereas: after long centuries of Russian Czarist rule, the subjugated people of Lithuania did on February 16, 1918, establish a free government of their own and declare their independence, and

Whereas: few nations have fought more courageously for their freedom nor suffered so much at the hands of tyranny, both under the yoke of Nazi Germany and later as a Captive Nation beneath the heel of the Russian Communist dictatorship, and

Whereas: we join with other citizens throughout America in pledging our support of the valiant people of Lithuania and embrace those who have contributed so greatly to this country after coming to the United States.

Now, Therefore, I, Michael N. Petito, supervisor of the Town of Oyster Bay do

hereby proclaim the week of February 16th, through the 22 as Lithuanian Independence Week in the Township of Oyster Bay.

MICHAEL N. PETITO,
Supervisor.

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE, COUNTY
CENTER, RIVERHEAD, N.Y.—PROCLAMATION

Whereas, fifty years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania became an independent republic; and

Whereas, despite valiant and continued efforts the freedom and independence then obtained by the Lithuanian people has long since been lost beyond the Iron Curtain; and

Whereas, Lithuania, proud of her traditions, proud of her language and customs, through many centuries has resisted any assimilation with other nations; and

Whereas, we Americans have a warm and natural understanding of the hopes of freedom-loving and freedom-seeking peoples; and

Whereas, it is fitting that we direct the attention of our American people to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people and to the importance of these aspirations in the efforts of all free people to establish a lasting peace; and

Whereas, we in Suffolk County hold in high regard the part which our citizens of Lithuanian heritage play in our community and national life;

Now, therefore, I, H. Lee Dennison, County Executive of Suffolk County, do hereby proclaim the week of February 18, 1968, as Lithuanian Independence Week and do urge all of the citizens of Suffolk County to cooperate with their fellow Americans of Lithuanian extraction in the celebration of this day.

H. LEE DENNISON,
County Executive of Suffolk County.

NASSAU COUNTY, STATE OF NEW YORK, OFFICE
OF THE EXECUTIVE—PROCLAMATION

Whereas: our sorrow is profound because the once great Lithuanian nation of the Middle Ages and the proud and progressive Republic of the period between the two world wars lies under a new yoke—that of Soviet Communism; and

Republic of the period between the two world wars lies under a new yoke—that of Soviet Communism; and

Whereas: it is tragic that the Lithuanians enjoyed such a brief period of freedom after more than a century of domination; and

Whereas: we join the Lithuanian people in prayer for their eventual liberation; and

Whereas: the aspirations of the Lithuanian people and their hopes for liberation and independence are not forgotten by the people of America and the free world; and

Whereas: we proud to recall Lithuania's many important and valuable contributions to civilization and world culture through the long centuries of her existence; and

Whereas: it is an honor to join our Lithuanian friends in celebration of their 50th Anniversary of a proud day of History. It is an occasion for renewed hope.

Now, therefore, I, Eugene H. Nickerson, County Executive of Nassau County, offer earnest hope to the heroic people of Lithuania and do hereby proclaim February 16, 1968 as "Lithuanian Independence Day."

EUGENE H. NICKERSON,
County Executive.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 13, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Earl V. Best, Refuge Christian Church, Noblesville, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we invoke Thy blessings upon us. In gratitude for Thy continued

presence, we courageously face this day knowing that "we are still with Thee."

In the blessed assurance of Thy never-failing presence, may our sense of indebtedness to Thee be reflected in united dedication to the alleviation of the needs

of Thy children. For even as "a home divided against itself cannot stand," just so must the efforts of its members fail unless dedicated to Thee.

Bless, we pray Thee, the Members of the Congress assembled, the President of

the United States, and all who share in the high honor of service in Government.

Especially remember our Armed Forces and grant that peace, with justice and honor, shall reward those who contribute so unselfishly to the cause of freedom. In the name of our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 12, 1968, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12603. An act to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (78 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes.

THE REVEREND EARL V. BEST

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am so very pleased that the Reverend Earl V. Best, of the Refuge Christian Church, Noblesville, Ind., was afforded the privilege of giving the opening prayer before this House today. Reverend Best is my own pastor and is much loved by the people of his church. During World War II he was a Navy chaplain, and served many months at sea, rendering comfort to the suffering and the dying. He is, indeed, a great man.

For the past few days, I am sure we are most aware that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is in town. They are here for their annual legislative conference. Reverend Best served as national chaplain for VFW during the year 1962-63. For 9 years, he has been the department chaplain for the Department of Indiana Veterans of Foreign Wars. During my travels in life, I have met many good and just men. But I must state that Rev. Earl V. Best is the finest gentleman I have ever known. He is truly a man of God and most beloved by all members of this great veterans organization. I am so pleased that he could be with us this morning.

DESIGNATING THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1968, FOR CELEBRATION OF PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1092) designating Thursday, April 11, 1968, for the celebration of Pan-American Day.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1092

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 11, 1968, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day, after the reading of the Journal, remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANOTHER BILL THAT IS WORSE THAN USELESS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, surrender to pressure groups is following its usual course in Congress in an election year. The current example is capitulation to the demands of the advocates of additional civil rights legislation. A primary objective of the bill is to bring to life the open housing provisions which died when previous legislation failed of enactment 2 years ago. Under its terms, 80 percent of property owners will lose their right to select the person to whom their property is to be sold or rented. Here, as in so many other areas, the Federal Government will take over jurisdiction and another of the shrinking list of rights guaranteed to the individual by the Constitution will be gone.

The only creditable part of the bill is inclusion at the last moment of riot control language which, if enforced, will help to prevent a recurrence of last year's violence. Bills containing riot control provisions twice have been passed by the House but have been disregarded in the Senate, but presumably there is now sufficient interest in this legislation to insure action without tacking on riot control language on civil rights legislation.

The bill will not satisfy the civil rights activists. They can never afford to be satisfied or they will lose their places of prominence in the movement. Its passage will inflict incredibly bad law upon the general public. Like so many others in the field of civil rights, the measure is unconstitutional on its face but no high Federal court will ever call it such. The bill goes far beyond the power vested in Congress under the 14th and 15th amendments. It is directed against the rights of individuals and against States rights. Legal students, noting the ridiculous lengths to which some sections of the bill would go, point out that a white man who threatens Rap Brown, for instance, may be indicted for a felony, but a Negro uttering the same threat under the same circumstances would be exempt.

I wonder how far Congress is prepared to go to satisfy militants whose only interest is more power for themselves?

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS HEARINGS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, my own duties made it impossible to follow the televised hearings that have just been completed in the other body's Committee on Foreign Relations.

But I had the opportunity yesterday and last night to talk to a number of the Veterans of Foreign Wars from my own State who were in Washington for a national conference, and who did follow very closely the progress of those hearings and the testimony of the Secretary of State. Without exception, the members of the VFW from Oklahoma who followed those hearings came away deeply impressed by the sincerity, the ability, and the dedication of Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

While many of them said they felt there had been worthwhile results in our own country in terms of better public understanding proceeding from those hearings, some of them felt that there was a danger in the hearings that the wrong kind of message might reach Hanoi and Haiphong with regard to the resolution of the American people to see through our commitments in Asia to defeat Communist aggression.

I think the department commander for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Oklahoma probably summed up the reaction of these Americans when he sent the following wire, handing me a text of it last night:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.:

Oklahoma veterans commend you on the forthright and impressive testimony you have rendered in behalf of our fighting men in Viet-Nam and for your forceful presentation of the threat which Communist aggression in Asia presents to free men everywhere and to our own country and its security.

HUBERT DUNAGAN,
Commander, Department of Oklahoma,
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE BRILLIANT TV PERFORMANCE OF SECRETARY DEAN RUSK

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and Monday I had the opportunity, like most Americans, to follow the television hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at which Secretary Rusk testified.

I was deeply impressed with the quiet, rational, even-tempered, and persuasive job which our great Secretary did, in spite of the glare of the television lights and the incredible goading of some members of the committee.

The picture of Vietnam that emerged from these hearings was a somber one. But the Secretary's testimony gave the American people a clearer picture of why we are in Vietnam; why in spite of difficulties we cannot pull out; why it is essential to our security and our national objectives that we stay; and that it is the North Vietnamese, not ourselves, who have spurned every effort to reduce the fighting and find an honorable end to the conflict.

Americans all wish, I am sure, that we were not in Vietnam. We wish there might be some simple, easy way out. Many committee members tried to float just that sort of balloon over television. But, Secretary Rusk kept the Nation's collective feet on the ground, and brought us back to the sober realities that confront us in Vietnam, just as they have confronted us at other critical periods in our history.

My own impression of those hearings is best expressed in the comments of one of my constituents over the phone yesterday: "Thank God we have a man like Dean Rusk negotiating for us in this complex Vietnam situation."

THANK GOD FOR SECRETARY RUSK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for the statements that they have just made in connection with the appearance of Secretary Rusk in the other body. What they have said—the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Oklahoma—needed saying. The Secretary of State outlined as dispassionately but as firmly as any man could the position this country occupies in the world.

I agree with the constituent of the gentleman from New York, who wrote: "Thank God for Secretary Rusk."

APPEARANCE OF SECRETARY RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was struck with the demeanor and the ability of Secretary Rusk to field the questions and to sit for 2 days and take the harassment that he got, but there was something that struck me even more significantly than that. I do not know if it occurred to anybody else in this body, but it did occur to some of my constituents. I called a few of them and asked them about it.

This was the fact that the chairman of the committee, in his opening statement, said one of the reasons he took the position he did was because the war in Vietnam was preventing the United States from solving our serious problems here at home. Then, in a few minutes, the chairman adjourned the committee and went upstairs to be one of 21 who voted against the civil rights bill.

I am not here to discuss the merits of the bill. But I think the chairman's actions will be some kind of anomaly that the American people are not going to overlook. While that may do the chairman a lot of good in Arkansas, I do not think it did him very much good in the country at large.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, would not the gentleman from Ohio agree that the gentleman to whom he refers, the gentleman in the other body, has had far too big a voice in times gone by with foreign policy in this country, and if it is awry, the gentleman has had a lot to do with it going awry?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman the chairman in the other body kept saying over and over and kept demanding that the Secretary consult with "this committee"—meaning the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—and with "this body"—meaning the Senate. I would just remind the gentleman in the other body—and I hope the gentleman from Louisiana agrees with me—that there is another coequal body, and that the Senate and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are not running this country to the exclusion of this body or of the executive branch.

THE ABILITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO ASSIMILATE FACTS AND MAKE PROPER DECISIONS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, like some of my colleagues I was somewhat concerned as to the effect the televised Senate hearings of the past 2 days might have had upon the public morale of this country. Like some others of them, I made a serious effort yesterday evening to telephone a cross section of people in my district who I imagined would have been listening to those hearings.

What I discovered was not quite reassuring. I believe my concern was needless and groundless. Most of the people with whom I talked had heard at least a part of the hearings and all of the people with whom I talked reported their feelings that these public hearings had increased their confidence, not decreased their confidence, in the basic rightness and the basic morality of the position of the United States.

Again and again in these conversations the comment was volunteered by those whom I queried that they felt Secretary Rusk in a very difficult situation had handled himself quite admirably. Again and again they commented that they felt he had divulged faithfully and in detail facts which they found extremely interesting and in the main extremely reassuring.

The people with whom I talked reported to me additional comments which they had been hearing from other citizens. The clear consensus was that people appreciated the information, appreciated Secretary Rusk's obvious mastery of the facts and of the situation, and felt that the sum result of the hearings had been to increase public confidence in this Nation's general objective in Southeast Asia and our basic manner of pursuing these objectives.

So it was to me reassuring and comforting that the American people are demonstrating once again the great basic stability of this Nation, its great ability to endure stress and strain and difficulty, and the ability of the American people when given the facts to assimilate them, whether they be good or bad, and to do the right thing.

SECRETARY RUSK

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, again Secretary of State Dean Rusk has defended American foreign policy brilliantly, with dignity, a superb patience and ability. I have never been more proud of an American statesman.

Secretary Rusk cannot and will not advocate the pathetic and incredible policy of appeasement as manifested by Chamberlain, Daladier, Lord Halifax, and Bonnet at Munich. Secretary Rusk realized before most of us on Capitol Hill the danger to the future of the free world of Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. Secretary Rusk is well aware that the road of appeasement is the road to world war III. By standing firm in Vietnam, we are thus standing firm in Berlin, in the Caribbean, and throughout the world. If we reward Communist aggression in South Vietnam, we will be faced with similar Communist aggression in countless areas of the world and, indeed, on the soil of our own country.

Secretary Rusk is devoted and dedicated to a foreign policy for tomorrow—a policy to prevent the youth of our Nation from being poured down a rat-hole of no return and from the indescribable horror of nuclear war.

Where would the appeaser, the peace demonstrator, the architect of harassment here on Capitol Hill stand up to aggression? We are entitled to know now. Would they stand up in the Philippines, Alaska, or in Oregon? Would they stand up for the cause of freedom anywhere?

Our men in South Vietnam, led by President Johnson, Secretary Rusk, and General Westmoreland, are fighting for peace and against world war III. They have earned, through their gallantry, fidelity, and dedication, the support and loyalty of every American.

MOSCOW PROPAGANDA BEING USED BY POLISH GOVERNMENT

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I feel it necessary to call to the attention of the Members the Moscow-produced clichés which the Polish Communist dictatorship in Warsaw is using as they conduct a massive propaganda campaign, as well as typical police state tactics, in attempting to suppress the legitimate outburst of political frustration in Warsaw and other cities of Poland.

The charge by the Polish Communist government that the most recent upheavals throughout Poland are in any way related to the CIA and Zionist influences are Communist propaganda utterances that bear a clear Moscow stamp. The Polish Communist dictatorship has in the last 12 years become as "Stalinist" as any dictatorship in Eastern Europe and the Polish Reds have belligerently suppressed the nationalism of the Polish people.

We must note that the outbreaks in Poland commenced when Communist authorities banned the performance of a classical anti-Russian play. The Polish Communist rulers are more Russian than they ever have been Polish and their development of the charge that Zionists have played a role in the demonstrations merely demonstrates their use of Moscow-conceived propaganda, which is historically and currently anti-Semitic.

The newest example of unrest behind the Iron Curtain demonstrates the need for the United States and free world groups to work with legitimate nationalist elements within the country and not to prop up by trade or diplomatic moves the Soviet-imposed dictatorships of Eastern Europe.

It is a historic irony, Mr. Speaker, that the Warsaw Communist dictators are resorting to anti-Semitism when next month will be the 25th anniversary of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto against the Nazi occupation.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS HEARINGS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with others of my colleagues in commending the job that was done by our distinguished Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, in the last 2 days.

I want particularly to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] on what I think was a very excellent statement because it seems to me it calls to our attention some of the responsibilities we have in really laying out the facts before the people.

I had a call this morning from my district which bore out the statement of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], I think, with reference to the impression received by the American people in these past 2 days of hearings.

I want to cite his concluding remark, because it so well expresses my own feelings. He expressed his admiration for Secretary Rusk and the outstanding job he did and then said that Secretary Rusk looked 10 feet tall and that this was undoubtedly due to the contrast between his stature and that of some of the men sitting across the table from him.

These hearings, I feel, have been good for the country because they have given the people of our Nation an opportunity to see our country's position most ably defended in eloquent terms by a man who will certainly go down in history as one of the greatest Secretaries of State ever to serve this Nation.

But the hearings also revealed the depths to which some of our highly placed persons have fallen in their endeavors to harass the administration in the discharge of its duties, and for reasons which are open to suspicion to say the very least. The political headhunting is costing American lives abroad and serves to delay the end of what is to all of us a very sorrowful and heartbreaking conflict in Southeast Asia.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORT ON VETERANS' HOUSING BILL, H.R. 10477

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 10477, the veterans' housing bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOLDING CERTAIN CHILOCCO INDIAN SCHOOL LANDS AT CHILOCCO, OKLA., IN TRUST FOR THE CHEROKEE NATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 536) to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of \$3.75 per acre to the Federal Government, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1146)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 536) to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Oklahoma, in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of \$3.75 per acre to the Federal Government, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered (1).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (2), (3), (4), (5) and (6); and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title and agree to the same.

JAMES A. HALEY,

ED EDMONDSON,

ROY A. TAYLOR,

E. Y. BERRY,

JAMES A. McCLURE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE S. MCGOVERN,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

PAUL FANNIN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 536) to hold in trust for the Cherokee Nation certain Chilocco Indian School lands in Oklahoma upon payment to the United States of \$3.75 per acre, submit this statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

Amendment No. 1: This amendment reserves to the United States the minerals in the lands to be held in trust for the Indians. Under the House bill the minerals would be included in the trust. The Senate recedes.

Amendments No. 2 and No. 4: These amendments provide that title to the lands involved will be conveyed to the Indians, rather than held by the United States in trust for the Indians, and that the title will be subject to no exemption from taxation or restriction on use, management, or disposition because of Indian ownership. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment deletes from the conveyance the interest of the United States in 77 acres of land that had

previously been conveyed to third parties subject to a reservation to the United States of the minerals in the land and subject to the right of the United States to a reversion of title if the land ceases to be used for public purposes. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment makes the conveyance subject to existing rights-of-way. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: This amendment directs the Indian Claims Commission to determine the extent to which the difference between the value of the title conveyed and the price paid should be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Committee. The House recedes.

JAMES A. HALEY,
ED EDMONDSON,
ROY A. TAYLOR,
E. Y. BERRY,
JAMES A. MCCLURE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE CHEROKEE NATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill, authorizing reconveyance to the Cherokee Nation of more than 2,600 acres of land acquired from the tribe by the Government in the last century, is both timely and equitable. I deeply appreciate the strong support which this measure has had, along bipartisan lines, in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and in this body.

Chief W. W. Keeler, of the Cherokees, and the tribe's able counsel, Earl Boyd Pierce, have placed on record the tribe's intention to use a major part of revenues from this land to provide educational assistance and scholarships to Cherokees. This is a splendid purpose and will help to meet a genuine need.

I want to say a special word of appreciation to the Honorable JAMES HALEY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, who has supported this bill since I first introduced it in the 89th Congress. JIM HALEY is one of the greatest friends the American Indian has ever had in the Congress, and I know that Oklahoma Indians have the highest regard and respect for him. Their feeling in this regard is shared by Indians throughout America.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that all of my colleagues who have helped make passage of this bill possible will visit our beautiful Cherokee Hills, in Oklahoma, in the near future.

There you will see the many constructive uses to which the Cherokees are placing their lands and property, to provide new opportunities for jobs, housing, and education.

Near Tahlequah, the historic capital of the Cherokees, you will also see the beginning of what will someday be recognized as "the Indian Williamsburg,"

combining an excellent reconstruction of an early Indian village—already complete—and a beautiful amphitheater in which the "Trail of Tears" drama is enacted.

Passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, helps the Cherokees to continue their progressive advance in Oklahoma. It helps to right an old wrong, restores part of the tribe's land base, and assures a greater educational opportunity for the Cherokees.

I am proud of the fact that no vote against this measure has been recorded by any Member of this House, either in committee or on the floor, and it has commanded unanimous support in this body throughout its consideration.

For this I am sure the Cherokees join me in a keen sense of appreciation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Ashley	Edwards, Ala.	O'Hara, Mich.
Berry	Fallon	Patman
Bingham	Gallianakis	Pelly
Brown, Calif.	Gardner	Pepper
Celler	Green, Oreg.	Resnick
Clawson, Del.	Hagan	Roth
Conyers	Harvey	St. Onge
Davis, Ga.	Herlong	Scheuer
Dawson	Hosmer	Selden
de la Garza	King, Calif.	Teague, Calif.
Dent	Kornegay	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Mailliard	Utt
Dowdy	Mathias, Calif.	Vanik
Eckhardt	Morse, Mass.	Watts

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceeding under the call were dispensed with.

VACATING CONSENT FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, AND GRANTING PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the authority previously granted to Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary to sit today be vacated, and that in lieu of that request Subcommittee No. 2 of the Select Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RECREATION FUNCTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 280)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the past few years Congress and the President have pledged to make the Nation's Capital a model of excellence for America: in government, in housing, in city planning, in law enforcement, in transportation.

But the quality of any city is not just a matter of efficiency and public order. If it is to be truly great, the city must be lively and inviting—a place of beauty and pleasure.

The city's life is lived not only in its buildings, but in its pools, playgrounds and recreation centers, in the places where the young gather to find excitement and delight, where the old come to find relaxation, fresh air, companionship.

In Washington, recreation is a vital element of the city's school enrichment activities, its model city project, and its summer programs.

But the D.C. Recreation Department is not an integral part of the District Government. With its six-member independent board, the autonomy of the Department prevents the D.C. Commissioner from providing policy supervision to the city's recreation activities and from relating them to other community service programs—in health, education, child care, and conservation.

There is no reason to distinguish between recreation and other community service programs now vested in the Commissioner.

Accordingly, I am today submitting to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1968. This plan brings recreation programs under the authority of the D.C. Commissioner. It enables the new City Government to make recreation an integral part of its strategy to bring more and better community services to the people who live in the city.

The Plan achieves these objectives by abolishing the present Recreation Board and the Office of the Superintendent of Recreation. It transfers their functions to the D.C. Commissioner.

The accompanying reorganization plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code. I have found, after investigation, that each reorganization included in the plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code.

Closer coordination of recreation with

other municipal improvement programs of the District Government and the improved efficiency of recreation management will produce a higher return on the taxpayer's investment in recreation programs, though the amount of savings cannot be estimated at this time.

I urge the Congress to permit this reorganization plan to take effect.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 13, 1968.

REORGANIZATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 279)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Urban Renewal is a vital weapon in the Nation's attack on urban blight and physical decay. In the firm hands of a local executive determined to improve the face of his city, it is a powerful tool of reform.

In the District of Columbia, urban renewal is managed by a Federal Agency, the D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency, headed by an independent five-man Board of Directors. Although the District Government pays the entire local share of the costs of urban renewal and although the Commissioner of the District of Columbia appoints three of the five members of the RLA Board, the Agency need not follow the Commissioner's leadership or administrative direction.

To strengthen the D.C. Commissioner's authority to initiate and guide the administration of urban renewal, I am today transmitting to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1968. This plan:

- gives the D.C. Commissioner the authority to appoint all five members of the RLA Board, by transferring to him the appointment function now vested in the President;
- transfers to him the authority to prescribe the rules and regulations governing the conduct of business by RLA. This function is now vested in the Board of Directors.

Urban Renewal involves slum clearance, demolition, the relocation of families, the provision of new housing, the stimulation of rehabilitation and new employment. Throughout the Nation, it is clear that authority and leadership by the local chief executive is essential to weld together the full range of municipal functions and community service programs to change conditions in city slums.

In our Capital City the hopes for a balanced New Town and new housing development on the Fort Lincoln site in Northeast Washington, the rebuilding of the Shaw neighborhood, and a successful Model Cities program hinge on the leadership of the D.C. Commissioner.

Members of the Congress have repeatedly stressed the need to establish the Commissioner's effective control of all functions essential to local redevelopment. The attached plan takes a major step toward that objective.

The plan does not alter the corporate status of the Redevelopment Land Agency or any of the authorities now vested by law in the Agency.

The accompanying reorganization plan has been prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code. I have found, after investigation, that each reorganization included in the plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code.

There are no direct savings deriving from this plan. However, it will improve the management of programs aimed at reviving the deteriorated social, economic, and physical structure of this city, our National Capital. The benefits and savings from a more successful attack on these problems cannot be estimated in advance, but their reality cannot be denied.

To achieve our goal of a model Capital, I therefore urge the Congress to permit this reorganization plan to take effect.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 13, 1968.

THE NATION'S FIRST CITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 278)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

A British Ambassador, serving here in the early part of the century, glimpsed the great hope of the American people for their capital city. He wrote:

What you want is to have a city which everyone who comes from Maine, Texas, Florida, Arkansas or Oregon can admire as being something finer and more beautiful than he had ever dreamed of before; something which makes him even more proud to be an American.

Washington—the city of noble monuments, quiet splendor, and the close touch of history—is truly the Nation's pride.

But Washington is also another city—a community of families with their needs, their wants, and their expectations.

For too long, America saw only the historic city and ignored the city of people. At the seat of democracy, democracy's work went undone, and the other Washington became a place to be endured rather than enjoyed.

Last year, Washington came into its own. After a century of waiting we gave it the machinery of modern government.

Now that government is going about its quiet—but exciting—mission.

A Mayor is in city hall, in touch with the people, his leadership infusing con-

fidence. A City Council is in action, providing meaningful representation for the citizens of the community.

These are the breakthroughs. Now we must consider the followthroughs.

That is the concern of this Message. It presents my proposals to:

- Redouble the attack against crime
- Revise the hopes of the people with: jobs for those who need them, education for the children who must prepare for the future, decent homes for the families so long without them
- Renew the historic city for the enjoyment of all the American people
- Reinforce the new strength of municipal government through further reorganization, and long-overdue salary increases for the public servants of the nation's Federal city.

TO DRIVE CRIME FROM OUR MIDST

The long shadow of crime falls over the streets of the nation's capital, mocking its proud institutions.

Each time a storekeeper is threatened at gunpoint—each time a woman is terrorized on her way home from work—each time a burglar breaks into a home at night—the liberty of every citizen is diminished.

Crime today is the first problem in the nation's first city. It is on the rise. The rate of increase in January was the lowest in 19 months—but that fact would provide little comfort for the victims of these crimes:

- 24 murders and rapes
- 758 automobile thefts
- 786 robberies and aggravated assaults
- 1864 burglaries and major larcenies.

As we know, crime feeds on society's oldest imperfections—poverty, ignorance, blocked opportunities, the lack of a job and the dimming of hope.

In the District as in the nation these are the urgent matters on our agenda for action. But the clear fact remains that progress can only be achieved in a climate of public order.

And so long as there are those who flout the law and tyrannize their neighbors, public order depends on an effective police force.

THE DISTRICT'S POLICE

Our goals for the District's police force are these: that it have the full confidence of the community, operate at full strength, be fully effective, fully equipped and fully paid for the risks of protecting our lives and property.

STRENGTH AND EFFICIENCY

The uniformed strength of the Police Department is now fixed at 3,100.

It has always been a problem to recruit and retain enough qualified men to reach full strength.

Within the last year, the numbers of vacancies have been sharply reduced. A pioneering program by Mayor Washington to recruit returning servicemen at their separation points has added to the Department's strength.

In the coming months, the Mayor will be stepping up all of his recruiting programs, with particular emphasis on reaching eligible young men who live in the District.

I have asked the Mayor to conduct a searching survey of the needs of the city,

to determine whether the authorized strength of the Department should be further increased.

Freeing a trained policeman from routine tasks and clerical work—and moving him from precinct house to patrol car—will help to enhance the public safety.

I propose that we do this in three ways. First, I recommend that the Congress add 127 new civilian employees to the Department for work in precinct houses.

Second, I recommend that the Congress expand the Police Cadet Corps from 100 to 150 recruits. These young men can take over many of the routine police functions while they are training.

Third, I recommend legislation authorizing the Mayor to organize, train and equip a force of 700 reserve police officers.

This reserve force would release regular policemen for needed law enforcement assignments. It would also widen and strengthen citizen participation in crime control in their neighborhoods, thereby strengthening police-community relations.

The reservists would serve without pay. They would receive free uniforms, be carefully trained, and operate under the close supervision of the police department.

TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE POLICE FORCE

Last week the District of Columbia achieved a long-sought and much-needed objective. Every patrolman is now equipped with radio communications, to be in instant contact with his headquarters.

Throughout the Department, the most advanced communications networks and computers are being installed.

Modern equipment, from patrol cars to motor scooters, are also being added.

I urge the Congress to approve the budget request of \$3.4 million for these and other essential crime-fighting tools.

I also urge the Congress—once again—to enact promptly the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, which will strengthen the local police forces of all the cities of this land, including the nation's capital.

Each day's delay in enacting this vital anti-crime legislation carries a heavy cost. It can be counted in the murders, rapes and robberies that could be prevented, but are not—in the fear that could be forestalled, but is not.

POLICE SALARIES

Many a young man who might be attracted to police work is deterred by the prospect of salaries too low to raise a family in decency and comfort. It is an imprudent city which rewards the protectors of its safety and property by forcing them to live on the margin.

Salaries paid District policemen are now not competitive with those in other major cities—Washington ranks 11th in a comparison of 20 similar areas.

The Nation's Capital City police force should serve as a model for all the cities of America.

Initially the Mayor recommended a 7 percent pay increase for District policemen. That would have raised the minimum starting salary of a police private to \$7,500 a year and move Washington from 11th to 5th place among the Na-

tion's cities. That amount is now programmed in the D.C. Budget.

Recently, the House endorsed legislation which would provide for a 10.1 percent increase, with an \$8,000 starting salary. That measure is now pending before the Senate. The Mayor and I endorse the salary increases provided in the House bill.

If the Congress approves these higher pay levels, additional revenue will be required. The Mayor will shortly prepare and submit formally to the Congress a supplemental revenue bill to finance these long-overdue and well-deserved pay increases for the city's police force.

GUN CONTROL

If the District is to wage a successful battle against crime, it must have a strong gun control law.

Last year, almost 2,500 major crimes were committed in the Nation's Capital at gunpoint—murders, assaults and robberies.

Laxity in gun control legislation is an open invitation to tragedy. A pistol in dangerous hands is like a ticking time bomb. And today, in the District of Columbia, alcoholics, juveniles and mental incompetents are free to own deadly weapons.

The proposal I have recommended—the D.C. Gun Control Act—would help bring safety to the District's streets, homes and stores. It would:

- Require individuals to obtain a permit to possess or carry a pistol and limit the sale of pistols to those with valid permits.
- Prohibit possession of pistols by persons under 21, drug users, alcoholics, or mental incompetents, as well as drug addicts, felons, and other criminals.
- Add ten years imprisonment to the regular penalty when a firearm is used in a robbery or an attempted robbery.
- Require all rifles or shotguns to be unloaded and encased while being carried.
- Require stricter licensing of persons who manufacture, sell or repair firearms, and require records and reports to be made concerning sales and repairs.

This legislation is designed to safeguard the public order and to stop tragedy.

It would not, however, prevent any law-abiding citizen from owning firearms if he can show the need for such weapons to protect himself or his property.

I again recommend that the Congress promptly enact a strict gun control law for the Nation's Capital city.

CRIMINAL CASE BACKLOG

When criminal justice works slowly, it no longer serves as a deterrent. Quick action must be taken to remove the staggering backlog of criminal cases in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

To accomplish this, I urge the Congress to act on pending legislation to increase the number of judges on the court from 21 to 26.

I also endorse the legislation's provision to increase the compensation of the Chief Judge of the Court from

\$24,000 a year to \$28,000 and that of each Associate Judge from \$23,500 a year to \$27,500.

UNIFIED LOCAL COURT SYSTEM

To assure effective judicial machinery responsive to the needs of its people, a unified local court system for the District is needed. Several proposals pending before the Congress seek to achieve some measure of reform. But they do not go far enough.

After long study, the Judicial Council's Committee on the Administration of Justice has recommended that the following improvements be made:

- Transfer the Juvenile Court to the Court of General Sessions as a division of that Court.
- Place the administration of the Juvenile Court under the Chief Judge of the Court of General Sessions.
- Make the present judges of the Juvenile Court associate judges of the Court of General Sessions.
- Establish a unified social services unit of the Court of General Sessions.
- Transfer the criminal non-support and paternity jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court to the Domestic Relations Branch of the Court of General Sessions.

I am asking the Mayor to study these proposals and, in consultation with the Courts and the Attorney General, to develop legislation which will create a unified local court system of the highest excellence for the nation's capital.

EDUCATION

QUALITY EDUCATION FOR ALL CHILDREN

Education is the great adventure that leads to equality of opportunity. Every child should have the benefit of an educational program shaped to his capabilities, and designed to develop his full potential.

Only the teacher in the classroom can give him this.

Teachers are in short supply, and the competition for them is intense. A good teacher finds little attraction to join or stay in a school system which demeans him with inadequate pay.

Today, among 20 comparable big city areas, the District ranks 15th in salaries for beginning teachers. This sharply reduces the District's chances of recruiting qualified teachers. And it hampers the education of Washington's 150,000 school children.

I recommend that the Congress lift the minimum starting salary for teachers in the District of Columbia to \$7,000, and provide comparable increases for experienced teachers. The Mayor joins me in this recommendation.

This legislation is needed. It is essential. It will move the District from 15th to second place among the largest cities in the Nation. It will help the Nation's first city build a school system of first rank. The Mayor's supplemental program will include new revenue proposals to finance this vital community service.

THE DISTRICT SCHOOLS AND THE COMMUNITY—A MODEL FOR THE NATION

How can the schools of our central cities serve their pupils better? How can they become portals to success for more

of their children? How can they reduce the number of failures and dropouts? How can they overcome the handicaps accumulated through years of neglect? How can they serve and involve the citizens of the community?

These are the critically important questions faced in the District of Columbia, as in every major city of America.

The Passow Report provides Washington with a blueprint for the total revival of its schools. It is a framework which will enable the people of the Nation's capital to build a vital and responsible school system.

I propose a major model school experiment in the District, embracing a significant area of the city. This program will:

- Revive the interest of citizens in their schools.
- Help teachers improve the skills of their profession through retraining opportunities.
- Bring to students the best in teaching methods and materials.
- Revise the curriculum to make it serve the young people of our city.
- Equip high school graduates with marketable skills.
- Seek alliances between employers and the schools.
- Give children the chance to learn at their own pace, reducing both dropouts and failures.
- Serve a section of the city where the needs of students and schools are greatest.

To support this program I have included \$10 million in my 1969 budget for the Office of Education to supplement the funds providing regular support for the D.C. schools.

With these additional resources, we can launch an exciting new venture in education—to continue for the next five years—as we seek new levels of quality and service in the schools of the nation's capital. That effort can become a beacon to the school systems in the other cities of the Nation.

I expect that this effort will result in:

- New programs for preschool children.
- Special attention to individual needs in the early years when children are learning to read.
- Opportunities for high school youngsters to work and attend school at the same time.
- Improved counseling and health services for children.
- A system for teacher retraining on a regular basis.
- New levels of cooperation among the schools and other agencies serving the people of the District.

SCHOOLS AND THE COMMUNITY

But schools will not serve children well unless they also serve the entire community. We need to develop a new concept—the Community School. It can be a place:

- for both learning and recreation.
- for adults, as well as children, serving the interests of people of all ages.
- for activities during summers and weekends and evenings.
- for reaching the family to reinforce the values the school seeks to impart.

With a small grant from the Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan, the D.C. schools have already begun to pioneer in developing community schools.

To enlarge this effort, I am directing the Commissioner of Education to work with the D.C. school system and the community service agencies of the District to start, as part of the new model program, a large-scale community school experiment.

AN ELECTED D.C. SCHOOL BOARD

Community education policies cannot be developed in a vacuum. They cannot serve the people unless the people have a voice in their formulation.

As I said last summer when I proposed an elected school board for the District of Columbia:

Washington's 150,000 schoolchildren and their parents—who now for the first time will be able to know the benefits of modern government—must also be able to exercise one of their most fundamental rights. They must have a voice which can be heard in the operation of their school system.

Both the Senate and the House have already passed bills to provide for an elected school board.

I urge final Congressional action on a bill which would:

- have the school elections correspond with the general elections.
- provide for close coordination between the Board of Education and the District Government to achieve the goal of schools as true centers of community life.

HOUSING

High on the list of the District's critical needs is decent housing.

The new housing program I have proposed to the Congress—to provide 6 million homes for low and moderate income families during the next ten years—will have a strong effect on Washington.

Already the District has been the scene of major pioneering successes:

The first "Turnkey" Project in the nation, fully engaging the private sector in the construction of low income housing, was built here.

The Nation's capital was among the 63 cities selected to plan and develop a Model Cities program. This will rebuild an entire slum neighborhood physically and bring new opportunities to its residents—health, jobs, education, recreation. Planning for this historic project is now rapidly proceeding.

The first conversion of Federal surplus land into a new community—undertaken last year at my direction—is off to a good start at the 335-acre site of the National Training School for Boys, known as Fort Lincoln:

- A team of outstanding city planners and architects has been selected.
 - The community is being planned with the help of the residents of the neighborhood, to assure that the new area fills the highest aspirations of the people of Washington.
 - The community will embody the latest advances in housing construction and education, as well as planning.
- This work can truly serve as a model for the Nation.

Mayor Washington has informed me that ground can be broken at the Fort Lincoln site by the summer.

During these planning months for the new community—before it actually takes shape—it can be put to constructive use. Its hills and ridges, its gymnasiums, classrooms, playfields and picnic groves should be available for the enjoyment of families from all the neighborhoods in the city.

I am asking the Mayor and the Federal agencies concerned to develop an action program to promote the maximum interim use of the site for the benefit of the citizens of Washington.

"SEED MONEY" FOR LOW INCOME HOUSING SPONSORS

Many unions, church groups and other nonprofit organizations want to sponsor low and moderate income housing for the people of the District.

They are unable, however, to obtain the funds they need—"seed money"—for the early stages of development.

I recommend legislation to establish a program under which the District government may advance loans to nonprofit sponsors of low income housing.

I also recommend legislation to establish a revolving fund for that program which will be financed by unclaimed property in the District.

RETALIATORY EVICTIONS

One of the most abhorrent injustices committed by some landlords in the District is to evict—or threaten to evict—tenants who report building code violations to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

This is intimidation, pure and simple. It is an affront to the dignity of the tenant. It often makes the man who lives in a cold and leaking tenement afraid to report those conditions.

Certainly the tenant deserves the protection of the law when he lodges a good faith complaint.

I recommend legislation to prevent retaliatory evictions by landlords in the District.

JOBS

As in every other city of America, there are men and women in Washington out of work—not because they prefer to be idle, but because years of opportunity denied have left them without skills, and often without ambition.

I have proposed to the Congress a major program to tackle the problem of the hard-core unemployed.

The spearhead of this effort is the National Alliance of Businessmen, which has selected Washington as one of the 50 cities where its job training and hiring program for the hard-core unemployed will proceed.

Improvement of outmoded laws in the District will help women and youngsters find meaningful work.

I recommend legislation to:

- Do away with the archaic requirements which must be met by youngsters under 16 before they can take after school jobs or work during the summer. Many needy children are deterred from earning a paycheck because the procedures for getting a work permit are overly stringent and detailed.

—Amend the "Female 8-Hour Law" whose provisions relating to certain business establishments in the District no longer accord with modern

working conditions. This change will permit women to volunteer for overtime work and pay.

THE DISTRICT AS THE NATION'S CAPITAL PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE COMMISSION

A Commission I appointed three years ago has made significant progress in its task of revitalizing the Pennsylvania Avenue area between the White House and the Capitol. Work has begun on the new FBI building. A great reflecting pool will grace the front of the Capitol.

The Commission is successfully linking the efforts of the Federal Government with private enterprise in developing this historic thoroughfare. It estimates that for every \$1 spent by the Government \$10 of private capital will be invested in the development of Pennsylvania Avenue.

But the Commission—so important to the District's future—still operates under a temporary charter. And the development of Pennsylvania Avenue is long-range work.

I again strongly recommend that the Congress enact legislation to give permanent status to the Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL

A year ago I called attention to the proposal by the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission to establish in the Nation's Capital an International Center for Scholars as a living memorial to the 28th President of the United States.

I then directed that the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue develop a more detailed proposal for such a Center.

That Commission has now recommended that the Center be built on the north side of the area designated as Market Square in the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan. Through an imaginative combination of public and private leadership and financing, this Center could serve as "an institution of learning that the 22nd Century will regard as having influenced the 21st."

The dream of a great scholarly center in our Nation's Capital is as old as the Republic itself. There could be no more fitting monument to the memory of Woodrow Wilson than an institution devoted to the highest ideals of scholarship and international understanding.

I recommend legislation authorizing the establishment of a Center to be operated by an independent board of trustees within the framework of the Smithsonian Institution. Trustees for the Center, in collaboration with the Government of the District of Columbia and the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission, and with the approval of the National Capital Planning Commission will work out detailed plans for the Center and for the development of Market Square.

INTERNATIONAL CENTER

Last year, I recommended that the Congress authorize an International Center, a large site at which foreign chanceries and the offices of international organizations could be located. After study, it now seems clear that acquisition of the site proposed at that time is not possible.

I am, therefore, recommending new legislation to authorize the use of 34 acres of the old National Bureau of

Standards terrain for these worthy purposes. The new site has the support of the Secretary of State, all other interested Federal Agencies including the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Mayor of the District of Columbia. I hope for early Congressional review and approval of this legislative proposal, important, alike to the Federal Government, to the District, and to the international community located in Washington.

NATIONAL VISITORS CENTER

Washington, D.C. attracts millions of visitors each year.

For all of its many years, the Nation's Capital lacked a center where the tourist and student could learn about the workings of his Government and find information about the city's monuments and museums.

The visitor of the future will have such a place to go, and will be able to enjoy more fully his stay in Washington.

Earlier this week I signed legislation authorizing the establishment of a National Visitor Center at Union Station.

Last year I asked the National Capital Planning Commission to conduct a thorough study of a transportation center in the vicinity of Union Station—one that would provide a hub to the airports, buslines, and railroads that serve the Nation's Capital. *I am requesting the Commission to speed the completion of the study of a Transportation Center so that its recommendations can be fully integrated into the detailed planning of the Visitor Center.*

ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

I urge Congressional approval of legislation to authorize the Trustees of the National Gallery of Art to construct an addition to the National Gallery of Art on Pennsylvania Avenue immediately east of the Gallery.

The construction will be paid for with private funds generously donated. The new building will provide additional exhibition space and room for a center for advanced studies in the history of art. It will also permit the expansion of the Gallery's extension services to the schoolchildren of the Nation.

STRONG MUNICIPAL LEADERSHIP

Those at the top levels of the city's government—the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, and members of the Council—should be adequately compensated.

They are in positions of great responsibility. They preside over a city which is not only the Nation's capital but the center of the fastest-growing metropolitan area in the United States.

I recommend legislation to raise the salary of the Mayor from \$29,500 to \$35,000 and the salary of the Deputy Mayor from \$28,000 to \$30,000.

The proposed increase would give the District's chief executives compensation comparable to that received by their counterparts of other major cities.

The members of the District Council who serve on a part-time basis also merit an increase in salary.

I recommend legislation to raise the salary of the Council Chairman from \$10,000 a year to \$15,000; the salary of the Council Vice Chairman from \$9,000 a year to \$12,500, and the salary of other

Council members from \$7,500 a year to \$10,000.

If the Council is to be broadly representative of the District, it must call upon the services of residents from all walks of life. Many who live in the District are also employees of the Federal Government. But the civic minded Government employee can serve on the Council only at a penalty. He is encumbered by the "dual compensation" law, whose effect is to bar him from receiving the supplementary salary for Council work—even though that work is extensive, involving long hours, nights and weekends.

This restriction does not apply to Council members who are privately employed.

There is no justification for this artificial discrimination. It should be ended.

I recommend legislation to exempt Council members from the "dual compensation" law.

SUPERGRADES

The city's administration can only be as effective as the men and women who operate the machinery of government—the trained managers, technicians, planners and experts in all the phases of the city's life.

The need to attract capable executives is of the highest importance to the new government of the Nation's first city.

I urge the Congress to take prompt action on pending legislation which will give the Mayor authority to classify and make appointments to 50 positions at the top levels of the Civil Service—Grades GS-16, 17, and 18.

The legislation would also authorize the Mayor, with the approval of the President, to place six additional positions at levels IV and V of the Executive Schedule.

REMOVING HATCH ACT RESTRICTIONS

The freedom to engage in the political life of the community which District Commissioners have always enjoyed should now be given to their successors—the Mayor and members of the Council.

This would not be inconsistent with the requirement for a nonpartisan Council. That forbids the Council from taking actions, or organizing itself, along partisan political lines. But it should not prevent members from participating in the political life of the city and the party of their choice if they wish to do so.

I endorse legislation recently introduced in the Congress to exempt the Mayor and the Council members from provisions of the Hatch Act prohibiting Federal and District employees from participating in political activity.

I also recommend that the Federal conflict-of-interest restrictions on Council members be adjusted to reflect a proper relationship with their part-time duties.

FINANCING THE DISTRICT GOVERNMENT FEDERAL PAYMENT FORMULA

The Congress has always recognized the fair share of the funds to operate the government of the Nation's capital city must come from the United States Treasury.

I again propose a realistic formula for the Federal payment to the District. I recommend legislation to establish the annual payment authorization at a level

equal to 25 percent of District general fund revenues.

This formula would provide a continually updated and equitable Federal payment. It would enable the District to compute the Federal share when it is planning its budget, so that priorities could be established among its most urgent needs.

This proposal does not involve the automatic payment of Federal funds for District purposes. The District government would not be able to spend either local revenues or the Federal payment authorization until funds have been appropriated by Congress. The District budget would continue to be acted upon each year by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

LOCAL REVENUE PROPOSALS

The District has developed new local revenue proposals for Fiscal 1969 that are prudent, equitable, and realistic.

These requests, presented in the District Budget for Fiscal 1969, reflect the unanimous view of the Council and the Mayor. They represent a responsible approach to balancing expenditures with income.

I recommend early approval of the legislative proposals in the District's revenue package. I also urge the Congress to support the Mayor's supplemental tax package developed to pay for the higher salaries for policemen, firemen, and teachers endorsed in this message. As important as they are, these increases should not come at the expense of the urgent construction and community service programs already incorporated in the D.C. Budget for Fiscal Year 1969.

STRENGTHENING THE MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT

Last year, I told the Congress that once a Mayor and Council were appointed "it will be possible to effect further improvements, both in the structure of the District Government and in its relationships to other agencies serving the Nation's Capital."

Now it is time for those improvements. Now it is time to strengthen the machinery of government in the District, to make it even more responsive to the needs of the people it serves.

We can do this by taking several steps: *I have signed today an Executive Order placing the National Capital Housing Authority under the direct supervision of the Mayor. This will provide greater scope and direction in the District's drive to build homes for the citizens of Washington.*

I am also today submitting two reorganization plans to the Congress.

First, to vest the functions of the D.C. Recreation Board in the Mayor. The Recreation Board is an autonomous agency, but it controls policy, operations and facilities affecting the youth of the city—swimming pools, playgrounds, and recreation centers. It is essential that these recreational programs be fully coordinated with the District's Youth, Summer and Poverty programs. The reorganization I propose will help to accomplish that vital purpose.

Second, to enable the Mayor to appoint the five-member Board of the Redevelopment Land Agency. Today he can only

appoint three members. The reorganization would also place the Board under the Mayor's effective control. The Redevelopment Land Agency is primarily responsible for carrying out urban renewal projects within the District. Giving the Mayor appointive authority will strengthen the city's attack on urban decay.

REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS

The citizens of the District have too long been denied a basic American right of representative government.

They have been denied a community voice where in a democracy that voice counts most—in the halls of the Congress.

The needs of the District cannot be adequately represented in the Congress by proxy, any more than could the needs of one of the 50 States.

I again endorse legislation to give the citizens of the District representation in Congress. I urge early action by the Congress on the proposals which it has under active consideration.

THE UNFULFILLED PLEDGE

With the proposals in this message we can carry forward the important work we began last year.

I ask the Congress to give them prompt and favorable consideration.

Even as I urge this, I look to the future, when the promise of the past will be achieved.

The oldest pledge of this Nation is self-government for the people. That pledge remains unfilled for the 800,000 citizens of America's first city—160 years after James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers that the citizens of the city which served as the Nation's Capital would have: "A voice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them."

Last year's reorganization has rekindled the promise of democracy in Washington. But the promise of democracy can never substitute for democracy itself.

I endorse home rule for the citizens of the Nation's Capital. For the 37 years I have been a resident of this city I have looked to the day when the promise of home rule would be realized and the District of Columbia could enter into full membership in the American Union. As long as I am President I will work to hasten that day's arrival.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 13, 1968.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO SUPPORTS PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE ON "THE NATION'S FIRST CITY"

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has once again focused congressional attention on the needs of the District of Columbia. And, once again, he has pinpointed accurately the areas of greatest need for District citizens.

As the President noted, a new District government is off to a promising start. But many serious problems remain and are demanding prompt and positive congressional action.

Mayor Washington and his administration need the funds to adequately cope with the problems of crime, unemployment, housing and better education for District residents.

And the President has rightly noted that the District still lacks representation in the Halls of Congress. I share his hope that the 90th Congress will correct this injustice.

For as the President said:

Last year's reorganization has rekindled the promise of democracy in Washington. But the promise of democracy can never substitute for democracy itself.

I commend the President for a wise, courageous, and helpful message that I am proud to support.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the Nation's Capital offers sound programs to improve Washington's schools.

Students in the District must face crowded classes, poor instruction, and outmoded curricula. In far too many cases, the Washington schools have become roads to frustration rather than avenues to success.

The President's message proposes several steps to help provide the quality education every child in the District needs—and deserves.

First, it proposes to lift the minimum starting salary for teachers to \$6,400—to increase the District's ability to recruit qualified teachers.

To overcome the handicaps accumulated through years of neglect, President Johnson has proposed a major model school experiment—using the most modern teaching methods and up-to-date curricula to equip graduates with marketable skills.

But the District's schools will not truly serve the children until it involves the adults in the community. Thus, the President has recommended a large-scale community school experiment to involve adults—along with children—in learning, recreation, and family activities.

We can hope for little long term progress in the District until we improve the quality of her schools.

This message marks an important first step in our efforts to improve these schools. It must be supported wholeheartedly by Congress.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the District of Columbia challenges Congress to act responsibly to meet many of the District's still unsolved problems.

Under the President's leadership, the Nation's Capital has achieved historic breakthroughs. But we know that progress is not self-generating, and that new hope can soon become bitter disappointment, if progress is not carefully nurtured.

This is the real meaning of the President's message. For, while he has acknowledged the really historic progress this community has achieved in recent years, he is also quick to remind us that so much more needs to be accomplished.

The President's legislative agenda for the District reflects what all of us well know are major problems. There are no surprises. We are all too well aware of the rising crime rate, the high rate of

unemployment, the inadequacies of the community's educational system, and the need for more housing—to take issue with any of these recommendations.

I earnestly hope that my colleagues will share the President's concern and act promptly to supply help in Washington's quest for a new era of hope and progress for all.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has given District residents something to cheer about. He has accurately assessed the most pressing problems confronting the community and has urged Congress to take action to deal effectively with each of them.

It is no secret that the crime rate here in the Nation's Capital is a matter of growing concern. The President has now asked Congress to provide funds for enlarging the Metropolitan Police Department, for increasing police pay, and for enlarging the District of Columbia court of general sessions. And he has rightly urged us to pass the Safe Streets Act that will help the District and other metropolitan communities battling crime.

The President has also recommended programs to fight the causes of crime. He has asked us to amend archaic age requirements for young people that prohibits after school jobs or summer work; and he has enlisted the efforts of the National Alliance of Businessmen to tackle job training and hiring programs for this community's unemployed.

The President has also proposed measures to further update and improve the District's governmental machinery.

These recommendations, in combination with other excellent proposals in the areas of education, jobs, and housing, constitute a hopeful and positive program to meet the needs of all of the District's citizens.

I hope Congress will be responsive to the sound recommendations the President has made.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in his message to Congress on the District of Columbia, President Johnson has offered a formula for progress for our Nation's Capital.

For years, visitors from throughout the United States have visited Washington and admired its wide avenues and monuments. But they ignored the needs of its people, unable to govern their own destinies.

While an antiquated governmental structure prevented the District from boldly acting, urban problems grew deep-rooted at the very seat of our Republic.

Last year, President Johnson and the 90th Congress gave the District an important start toward establishing the machinery of modern government—a Mayor with broad powers to act and a City Council with wide authority, albeit appointed rather than elected.

This year's message moves us from these historic beginnings to the exciting work of making Washington truly the Nation's First City.

The President has proposed for the people of the District, jobs for all who need—and want—them, quality education to meet the needs of tomorrow, decent homes for those so long without them and improved police protection.

To help the District government meet the crucial challenges ahead, the President offered a new reorganization to coordinate additional governmental functions under the Mayor.

But President Johnson has also recognized that Washington belongs to all Americans. He has proposed a national institute to make a scholarly center of our Nation's Capital; recommended permanent status for the Commission to revitalize Pennsylvania Avenue; and suggested an addition to the National Gallery of Art.

We have in the President's message a national resolve to erase the effects of years of neglect. We now must act on this resolve to bring to the residents of the District what they have so long deserved—a full share in America's blessings.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the Nation's Capital will help bring closer the day when Washington curbs—and reverses—its soaring crime rate.

Years of neglect have left in their wake the conditions upon which crime breeds—ignorance, poverty, discrimination, and hopelessness.

But progress can only be made on these root causes in a climate of order. For this, a stronger and more efficient police force is a necessity.

President Johnson proposed that more trained policemen be freed to patrol the streets by hiring additional civilian employees for clerical duties, by expanding the District Police Cadet Corps, and by organizing a large reserve police officer corps.

To insure the citizens of the District of adequate police protection, the President has recommended higher starting salaries—to attract and retain capable men—and promised the most modern equipment and communications facilities.

But a strong police force is not the entire answer. Thus the President has acted to reduce the staggering backlog of criminal cases in the District—which chokes criminal justice—and to pass a strong gun control law for Washington.

Congress could do no more important work this session than to enact President Johnson's anticrime measures for our Nation's First City.

Through these proposals we can set an example for all cities of America.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the Nation's Capital is significant for its effort to make Washington a shining example of urban beauty, American culture, and international scholarship.

Washington is the Nation's city. In it we should see the best of America reflected. President Johnson's message should help make Washington the kind of capital to which Americans may point with pride.

The President has recommended that his Special Commission To Revitalize Historic Pennsylvania Avenue be given permanent status to carry on its important work. For thousands of visitors this will mean a more beautiful Washington.

The dream of a great scholarly center in the seat of our Republic can become

a reality through the President's International Center for Scholars. For thousands of students, Washington could become the center of international learning.

For visitors to Washington, the President has recommended an addition to the National Gallery of Art and a coordinated transportation system to help tourists travel around our Nation's Capital.

The President's International Center to house foreign chanceries and international organizations will insure Washington's role as the First City of the World.

The President's programs can remake the face and spirit of our Capital to meet our fondest hopes.

We in Congress must give the National Capital the same attention we would our own hometowns—for Washington is the home of all Americans. We can do no less.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 281)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirement of Section 4(g) of the Department of Transportation Act, I am forwarding for the information of the Congress a joint report and recommendations by the Secretaries of the Department of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development on the logical and efficient location of urban mass transportation functions in the Executive Branch.

This report contains a valuable summary of studies and deliberations conducted by the two Secretaries over the past year. Reorganization Plan 2, which I transmitted to the Congress on February 26, 1968, will carry into effect those recommendations requiring action by the Congress.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 12, 1968.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND IN- VESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY RULE XI(8) INCURRED BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1168) on the resolution (H. Res. 1027) providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1027

Resolved, That the further expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) and H. Res. 110, Ninetieth Congress, incurred by the Committee

on Government Operations acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$875,000 including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittee within and without the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, delete "\$875,000" and insert "\$550,000."

On page 2, after line 13, add the following:

"SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law."

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

MR. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

MR. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson]—and I am the ranking member of the committee—I notice that the amount in the resolution has been substantially cut—as I understand, from \$875,000 to \$550,000. Is that correct?

MR. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

MR. HOLIFIELD. Does the gentleman care to explain to this Member and to the House why that cut was made?

MR. FRIEDEL. Quite a few members of our committee felt that the Committee on Government Operations was going far afield of its duties. There were some duplications, and some members of the House Administration Committee felt that some of the subcommittees were not actively working. We realize this is a drastic cut, and our committee will expect the Committee on Government Operations to return and ask for additional funds, but whatever new funds they ask for will have to be justified.

MR. HOLIFIELD. I appreciate the gentleman's answer. If he will yield further, I would like to make this comment: The House Committee on Government Operations has a well substantiated record of savings in the Government. The cost of this committee is very small in relation to the tremendous economies that have been made in the Government.

I view with a great deal of alarm this drastic cut. If there are criticisms of the procedures or the operations of this committee, I am sure, if the committee had been called before the House Adminis-

tration Committee and given an opportunity to answer the evident reasoning of the committee, they could have given to the committee a good account of the overall operations of this committee.

If there have been individual subcommittees that have not been doing their duty, of course that is a matter, I think, that can be cured by the chairman of the committee.

I recognize the parliamentary situation here today, that an amendment is not in order to raise this amount, but in view of the savings that have been attained by this committee over the years, that are well documented, I think there should be consideration of this. In fact, I can say my Subcommittee on Military Operations has saved the Government, through its investigations, far more than the overall budget of this committee. I know there are many other subcommittees that can also make the same claim, and I think they can substantiate it.

So I am not going to take any further time—which the gentleman has already so generously yielded to me—but I just will say I hope the Committee on Government Operations will have an opportunity to come before this committee in the near future and support its need for additional funds.

MR. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, our committee does realize the benefits and savings that the Government Operations Committee has made—far in excess of their appropriations—but the reason for this drastic cut is our committee is not satisfied with a few of the subcommittees which are supposed to be working and are not, from the information we have received. That is the reason for the drastic cut. If Government Operations Committee comes back to request more funds and show what they intend to do with any more money, we will consider their request very carefully.

MR. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, a member of the committee.

MR. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, may I say, as a member of the committee, it is my understanding this is not necessarily a final action, but we were informed today in committee that if the committee did not take action this month, there would be some employees of the committee who would not be paid. This action would be necessary in order for the investigative staff members to be paid this month. Therefore, the committee unanimously voted this out.

It is anticipated that the Government Operations Committee will come back later this year for such additional funds as they may justify.

MR. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MR. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Government Operations Committee, I feel that the House Administration Committee is perfectly within its right to question the large appropri-

ation requested by this committee on which I serve. The jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committee, among others, is "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency." We are certainly at a point in history where the problems of efficiency and economy deserve some attention.

If the Government Operations Committee would like to justify the request for increased expenditures which it filed with the House Administration Committee, I am sure that the minority members of the committee and the minority staff of the committee could assist them by suggesting areas for study by the Government Operations Committee. If the minority had more staff, it could suggest even more areas for study.

On the other hand, if the committee wishes to reduce its budget, I might suggest that it start with whatever staff member is responsible for locking the door between the cramped minority staff quarters and the full committee room in the Rayburn Building this morning so that members of the minority staff and Members of Congress who happen to be currently on the minority side of the committee, are obliged to use the public door from the hall rather than the more convenient door from the minority room to the full committee room. I have been advised that minority staff members do not have a key to unlock this door and I feel that such treatment of the minority is at best questionable.

The chairman of the Government Operations Committee knows that I have the greatest admiration and affection for him and he has always shown the greatest fairness to the minority and diligence in his service as chairman and as a Member of this Congress.

But the House Administration Committee also has its duty to perform and in this instance would seem to have performed that duty reasonably well.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE FURTHER EXPENSES FOR THE STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 312, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

MR. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1169) on the resolution (H. Res. 1045) to provide funds for the further expenses for the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 312, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1045

Resolved, That the further expenses for the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 312, incurred by the

Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or as a duly authorized subcommittee, not to exceed \$300,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, experts, and consultants (including personnel of the Library of Congress performing services on reimbursable detail) and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1170) on the resolution (H. Res. 1042) authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1042

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1968, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 18 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$425,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, delete "\$425,000" and insert "\$375,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, if given the opportunity at the appropriate time I will offer a motion to recommit this additional appropriation—the recommittal motion to require that the House Committee on Un-American Activities hold open hearings on the need for this money.

You might have noted, Mr. Speaker, that I referred to this legislation as an additional appropriation because this is what it is.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is by this bill asking for \$375,000 more money for 1968 than it automatically gets already as a standing committee pursuant to the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

By voting for my motion to recommit, a Member is merely asking that the need for this huge additional appropriation be proven—certainly a most responsible requirement.

Under the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the House Un-American Activities Committee is entitled to employ six clerks and four professional staff members. In 1966, for example, it received without a specific House resolution, an estimated \$158,304 for those 10 employees. The year before, in 1965, it received \$152,523 without any vote of the House of Representatives specifically authorizing those amounts.

To this must be added other automatic emoluments and allowances, as follows:

First, 1,000 copies of various committee documents, such as hearings, committee prints. These printing items are paid from the general printing and binding appropriation, which is a standard item in the legislative branch appropriation for each fiscal year.

The House Un-American Activities Committee also has additional printing bills for all of its hearings and reports. I have not checked into this, but my impression is that for almost every document printed by the committee there is a supplemental request to have it printed in a far greater number than the allocated 1,000 copies.

Second, each standing committee of the House is entitled to necessary stationery items upon requisition.

Third, each standing committee is authorized an annual stamp allowance of \$300.

Fourth, each standing committee of the House is authorized to send Western Union messages on official committee business.

Fifth, a committee is furnished without charge against its investigative funds all standard office equipment necessary to enable the committee to function properly. The same is true for office furniture.

It is therefore, clear that if a thorough accounting job was done on the expenses of both the regular standing committee and the special committee, that the cost of the House Un-American Activities Committee for the 89th Congress would not be the roughly \$800,000 that the committee indicates but, at least, 50 percent more or approximately \$1,250,000.

That is not an insignificant amount.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it is time that this great legislative body take a look at what is being done in its name and just how a million and a quarter dollars are being spent.

Because the legislative record of the committee is practically nil, it seems obvious that a great part of this money is being spent on the raw files of the committee.

The committee in its report to the Administration Committee, February 13, 1967, is proud of this activity, for it states as follows:

In 1966, the Reference Section answered 1,565 requests for information from Members of Congress and 2,806 from the Committee staff. Information checks were made on 4,775 individuals and 3,149 organizations named in those requests. Written reports were compiled on 3,173 subject items. In addition material was loaned to Committee staff members at a rate of about 300 per month. The section also prepared almost 16,000 exhibits for use in investigations, hearings and other phases of Committee activity. Representatives from 25 investigative agencies of the Executive Branch made 2,400 visits during the year to check the Committee's records.

Is this a proper function of the committee and, if so, where does it get the authority? There is nothing in the authorizing resolution for the committee granting it the authority to create and maintain a library containing rumor and gossip regarding American citizens—and to widely distribute this information under the name of the U.S. House of Representatives. Are committee files kept on Congressmen and their employees? We do not know but maybe it is about time we found out. Under whose control are the files kept? How much of the committee's budget is spent in compiling such information? Should this not be a function of the FBI and investigative agencies of the executive branch of the Government?

Let me give you an example on how information from the committee files was used in a March 1967 court case in Lynchburg, Va. In the case of the Commonwealth of Virginia against Wansley, the defendant Wansley was represented by an attorney named William L. Kuntzler. The following exchange occurred between counsel for the defendant and Carter Glass III, the owner of newspapers in Lynchburg. Mr. Glass had printed derogatory remarks about the attorney in his newspapers and the questions and answers refer to the source of that information:

A. I am willing to swear I have the in-

formation from my files from official sources saying that is correct.

Q. What official source did you get that information from?

A. I can't tell you what official source with regard to any particular item. I can tell you everything came from official sources.

Q. Now, you are going to be asked to produce these official sources. Now, when you say official—you say reports from the House on Un-American Activities, these are general reports published by the House Committee?

A. They are both general reports published by the House Committee and a specific search of their files for information on you at my request through William Munsford Tuck of the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia.

Q. You did this about me, you say long before the Wansley trial came up?

A. I didn't say that. I say I started my file in respect to you long before I ever heard of you in connection with anything concerning Lynchburg.

In addition to providing information to Congressmen, the committee provides services described by Chairman WILLIS in a letter dated April 4, 1967, to three of my colleagues, as follows:

Our files are searched four days a week, on a full-time basis, by 8 to 15 Representatives of certain Federal departments and agencies. Representatives of other agencies do the same type work at the Committee offices on an irregular basis. During 1966, the following departments and agencies sent personnel to search our files, regularly or occasionally.

The listing which follows includes 27 departments or agencies. In addition, 14 others were noted as having called on committee personnel for information. I have asked unanimous consent to have the exchange of correspondence resulting from this information included in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks. I believe it is most revealing. I wrote to only a few of the agencies or departments listed, but I suspect that the replies are fairly representative of the others.

You will note from a careful review of this correspondence that certain agencies have someone regularly at the committee's offices. You will also note that the authority for such activity stems from Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, which referred to the House Un-American Activities Committee as a source of information. However, Executive Order No. 10450 of April 27, 1953, specifically revoked the 1947 Executive order.

The House Un-American Activities Committee also searches income tax returns from time to time, as you will note from the letter signed by Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen. I presume this information is added to their files and made available on request by agency, department, or Congressman.

We know that the committee employs in the neighborhood of 60 people with special investigators and clerical help added from time to time, and also such persons, more difficult to classify, as the young man who was paid by the committee after his testimony in open hearing on H.R. 12047—commonly referred to as the Pool bill.

Since the committee collects and files information on hundreds of citizens of this country, I believe it is pertinent to ask what kind of controls the House of Representatives exercises over the han-

dling of this information and what kind of control the House exercises over the employees of the committee.

The first thing we should do is to refuse to authorize House Resolution 1042 until we get a clear understanding of how the committee spends its money and what it intends to do.

That is the purpose of my motion to recommit—to hold public hearings on the committee's need for the money.

I urge a ye vote on the motion to recommit.

The correspondence referred to follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1967.

Hon. DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: The following information is furnished in response to the questions in your letter of August 4, 1967, concerning Civil Service Commission searches of the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

1. What is the authority for using HUAC files as a source of such information?

Search of HUAC files was specifically required under Executive Order 9835 of March 21, 1947. Following issuance of Executive Order 10450 on April 27, 1953, it was determined by the Commission that the history of the national agency check included searches of appropriate files of congressional committees. This finding was published in the Federal Personnel Manual.

The Civil Service Commission is primarily responsible under Section 8(b) of E.O. 10450 for conducting investigations of persons entering or employed in the competitive civil service. In those cases in which other Federal agencies conduct their own full field investigations the Commission, by agreement, conducts the national agency checks for them.

Executive Order 10422 of January 9, 1953, dealing with the employment of U.S. citizens on the Secretariat of the United Nations, provides for investigations by the Commission and specifies that they shall include reference to the files of appropriate committees of the Congress.

2. How often does your agency use HUAC files as a source of information?

During fiscal year 1967 the Commission made approximately 288,000 searches against the HUAC files.

3. What is the procedure by which you search HUAC files and obtain information therefrom?

Civil Service Commission record searchers go to the HUAC file daily and conduct their own searches of the file by arrangement with the committee.

4. What happens to the information so obtained?

Information raising a question of loyalty is referred immediately to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for full field loyalty investigation. The FBI reports and the information obtained from the HUAC file search become part of a basic investigative file. This complete report is then evaluated to determine the person's fitness. If he is appointed to a sensitive position, the evaluation is made by the agency under the provisions of E.O. 10450. All other evaluations are made under Civil Service Commission suitability standards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1967.

Hon. DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: This is in response to your letter of August 4, 1967. The Office of

the Inspector General (OIG) is the investigative arm of this Department. It has been the custom for this Office to make limited pre-employment checks of individuals applying for the position of Special Agent or Auditor with OIG.

In response to your specific questions:

1. The authority for examining House Un-American Activities Committee files is the fact that OIG is a duly authorized Investigative Agency within the Executive Branch of the Government. Employees of HUAC recognize our credentials and will furnish requested information.

2. Because of the method used in filing our reports it is not practical to determine the number of occasions HUAC records have been examined. We have kept no specific records for this purpose.

3. The procedure used in examining these records is that our Special Agent will go to the Committee's file room and first identify himself. He is then granted access to several volumes of names which he compares with the name on which the inquiry is being made. In the case of positive information the hearings and other records would then be examined. It is pointed out that if positive information were located, this would be used only as an investigative source of information. It would be necessary to verify and expand on any information obtained. This information would be exhausted to a logical ending before an evaluation would be made.

4. Since it is not practical to examine files to determine what information has been obtained, we questioned our Special Agents who normally contact HUAC. To the best of their recollection all record examinations thus far have been negative.

I trust the above information will satisfy your request. If not, please advise me.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. ROBERTSON,
Assistant Secretary for Administration.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1967.

Hon. DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: This is in response to your letter to the Secretary of Defense dated August 4, 1967, requesting answers to questions pertaining to the use of the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee in relation to personnel security investigations on employees or applicants for employment with the Department of Defense.

In view of the fact that investigation on applicants for employment by the Department of Defense is conducted by the Civil Service Commission, the following information does not reflect Commission use of the Committee's files. The information furnished is applicable to investigations conducted for military personnel, Department of Defense contractors' personnel requiring access to classified defense information, and additional investigation on Department of Defense employees which may be required subsequent to that conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

1. Question: What is the authority for using HUAC files as a source of such information?

Answer: The authority stems from Part I, section 3.e of Executive Order 9835, dated March 21, 1947. This Executive Order was superseded by Executive Order 10450, dated April 27, 1953. Although section 3.(a) of the superseding Order did not specifically list all the agencies to be checked, it continued the requirements for a national agency check and it is considered the authority for continued check of the Committee's files.

2. Question: How often does your Department use HUAC files as a source of information?

Answer: Department of Defense investigators check HUAC files approximately 120 times a week.

3. *Question:* What is the procedure by which you search HUAC files and obtain information therefrom?

Answer: Department of Defense investigators check an alphabetic card catalog file maintained by the Committee and extract pertinent information from the Committee's files.

4. *Question:* What happens to the information so obtained?

Answer: When information is found in HUAC files which serves as a lead to further investigation, the appropriate additional investigation is conducted. Information of probative value is evaluated along with all similar information assembled in the investigative file.

Please let me know if you desire any further information.

Sincerely,

SOLIS HORWITZ.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1967.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: This is in response to your letter of August 4, 1967, to the Secretary concerning checks made by personnel of this Department of records of the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives.

1. Checks of the Committee records are made under two authorities: (a) for civilian employees under the authority of E.O. 10450 of April 27, 1953, as amended; and (b) for commissioned officers in the Regular or Reserve Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service of this Department, under the authority of Title 42, Section 21.155 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

2. As a general rule, a representative of the Office of Internal Security of the Department makes checks of the Committee's records several times each week.

3. A name search of the Committee's indices is made by a Departmental Security Specialist and references located are checked in the appropriate Committee publication or file.

4. Information obtained from the Committee's records is carefully reviewed and analyzed by the Department Office of Internal Security and considered together with data from all other available sources. Where significant derogatory information with respect to loyalty or subversive activity is obtained, the case is referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a full field investigation in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 10450.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Under Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1967.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: This is in reply to your request of August 4 for information concerning this Department's use of the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee for information on present employees or on persons seeking employment with the Department.

Section 3(a) of Executive Order 10450 provides that the appointment of civilian employees of any department or agency of the Government shall be subject to an investigation the scope of which shall be determined by the degree of adverse effect the employee could have on the national security by virtue of his position. The Order states that such an investigation shall include as a minimum a "national agency check," and written inquiries to local law-enforcement agencies,

former employers, references, and schools attended. Sections 8(b) and (c) of the Executive Order indicate that investigations of persons entering or employed in the competitive service are the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission, while the investigation of other employees, including consultants, is the responsibility of the employing department or agency.

Chapter 736-3 of the Federal Personnel Manual defines a "national agency check" as a check of the fingerprint and investigative files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the investigative files of the Civil Service Commission, and the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This Department is following the requirements set forth in the Federal Personnel Manual for all Federal agencies in examining the HUAC files as a part of its evaluation of individuals subject to national agency checks. The bulk of the employees of this Department are in the competitive service and as such their investigations are conducted by the Civil Service Commission. Non-competitive employee and advisory-type position checks are made by this Department pursuant to Chapter 736 of the Federal Personnel Manual.

In response to your other questions, representatives of this Department examine HUAC files about once a month. They check the indices and then review any referenced material contained in the library of the Committee.

A report of the check on Committee files is made by the HUD Inspection Division to the appointing authority on a confidential basis with a copy of the report retained in restricted files in the Inspection Division.

I hope that you find the above information satisfactory for your needs. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1967.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: This responds to your letter of August 4, 1967, concerning inspection of returns by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Your questions and our answers are shown below.

Question No. 1: What procedure does IRS use to determine the legitimacy of HUAC's requests? The standard of legitimacy, as defined by recent court decisions, in reference to questions propounded to a witness, is the relevancy of such requests to clearly indicated legislative purposes.

Answer: The legitimacy of HUAC's requests are generally satisfied by a letter from the Chairman of the Committee stating that the Committee has met and passed a resolution, in accordance with the rules of the House, setting forth the names and addresses of the taxpayers whose returns it is necessary to inspect and the taxable periods covered by the return. Executive Order 11358 authorizes inspection by HUAC "for the purpose of carrying on those investigations of subversive and un-American activities and propaganda authorized by clause 18 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, agreed to January 10, 1967." If the letter does not meet the requirements of the Executive Order and the regulations, the Chairman is so advised.

Question No. 2: Who determines whether a request is legitimate for IRS?

Answer: The letter from the Chairman of the Committee is addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, approved by that office, and forwarded to the Internal Revenue Service for compliance with the request.

Question No. 3: Approximately how many

requests for information does IRS receive from HUAC?

Answer: Our records indicate that since the first Executive Order was issued to this Committee in 1938 (the 75th Congress), we have received 22 requests.

Question No. 4: In what form does HUAC obtain such information?

Answer: Information is obtained by inspection of returns in the National Office of the Internal Revenue Service, or when necessary, in a district office of the Internal Revenue Service. The inspection of the returns is made by an authorized representative of the Committee.

Question No. 5: Is HUAC permitted to make copies of the information given to it by IRS? If so, are there any policy provisions enabling IRS to maintain control over confidential information it has provided to HUAC?

Answer: Authorized personnel of the Committee may inspect the material, may make notes, and may transcribe the data to blank returns. However, photostatic or other facsimile copies are not furnished. The Executive Order provides that "such inspection shall be in accordance and upon compliance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury in Treasury Decisions 6132 and 6133, relating to inspection of returns by committees of the Congress, approved by the President on May 3, 1955." The regulations provide, in part, that: "Any information thus obtained by such committee or subcommittee shall be held confidential: *Provided, however,* That any portion thereof relevant or pertinent to the purpose of the investigation may be submitted by the investigating committee to the appropriate house of the Congress."

Your final request was for any other information concerning this matter which we feel may be relevant. We think it is important to note that the granting of Executive Orders to Congressional committees has been a long established practice, both under the current Internal Revenue Code and under prior revenue acts. Similar Executive Orders were issued permitting inspection of returns by 30 Committees of the Senate and 23 Committees of the House from the 82d through the 89th Congresses, including the Committee of the Judiciary of the House of Representatives during the 82d and 83rd Congresses.

We hope that this provides the information you were seeking. If we can be of further help, please let us know.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1967.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: This is in reply to your recent letter in which you state that you have been informed by the Chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) that this agency sometimes calls on HUAC personnel for information on present employees or on persons seeking employment with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

This agency does not have occasion to request information from HUAC personnel on present or prospective employees of the Commission. As you know, security clearances for the Civil Rights Commission, as well as for many other Federal agencies, are conducted by the Civil Service Commission. Neither I nor, to my knowledge, any other Civil Rights Commission employee has called upon HUAC or its personnel for information concerning current or prospective employees.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. TAYLOR.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, once again the House Administration Committee has reported an appropriation for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This year the resolution provides for \$375,000. Last year it was \$350,000. This is in addition to the committee's general allotment authorized under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which in past years has averaged more than \$150,000. In 1966 it was \$158,304. Final figures for 1967 are not available, but will be close to \$160,000. It is expected to be the same for 1968, bringing the total budget to approximately \$535,000.

As I have stated repeatedly on the floor of the House, this committee serves no useful legislative purpose; its function is to expose and harass; it flaunts our constitutional principles; and it has brought discredit on the name of the House of Representatives.

Last year its appropriation was the sixth largest of the 20 standing committees. It was larger than such important committees as the Committees on Armed Services, \$300,000; Judiciary, \$250,000; Foreign Affairs, \$175,000; Agriculture, \$100,000, and Interior, \$100,000, which have legitimate legislative work to do.

Of the requests brought before the House this year it is the fifth largest. Only Education and Labor, \$554,000; Government Operations, \$550,000; Public Works, \$500,000; and Banking and Currency \$475,000, are higher; but such important committees as Interstate and Foreign Commerce, \$325,000; and Judiciary, \$250,000, are lower.

The Un-American Activities Committee also employed more people—46—on its payroll as of December 31, 1967, than all but the Committees on Government Operations, Education and Labor, Banking and Currency, and Appropriations. It has the fifth largest staff.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee manages to operate with 36 employees, the Judiciary Committee with 29 and the Ways and Means Committee with 22.

The legislative productivity of this committee bears no relation to its large budget. In the first session of the 90th Congress a total of 14,593 bills were introduced into the House. But only 20 bills were referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities. Of these 20, only six were substantively distinct, all of which come within the jurisdiction of other standing committees.

H.R. 8, the Pool bill, is a slight modification of H.R. 12047, which passed the House and expired in the Senate in the 89th Congress. It prohibits solicitation or collection of money or goods for use of foreign powers in armed conflict with the United States, and obstruction of troop or supply movements of U.S. Armed Forces. Five executive departments of the U.S. Government—Justice, Defense, State, Treasury, and Commerce—have reported against its enactment.

Two similar bills dealing with the obstruction of Armed Forces introduced in the 89th Congress—H.R. 11864 and H.R.

12775—were referred to the Judiciary Committee, which is the proper place for bills on this subject. In the 90th Congress legislation "providing penalties for interference with defense security systems"—H.R. 2846—was likewise referred to the Judiciary Committee.

H.R. 5942, dealing with passport restrictions, should be considered appropriately by the Judiciary Committee.

H.R. 735 is the perennial Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy bill which has been introduced in every Congress since the 86th and has been opposed by every administration. It clearly belongs in the Foreign Affairs Committee. Similar Senate bills are referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

H.R. 7025 reintroduces the so-called Klan bill in the 90th Congress. A very similar bill, H.R. 9076, was referred to the Judiciary Committee. The history of the Klan bill, which provides criminal penalties against terroristic activities of certain clandestine organizations is worth reviewing in detail. Nearly 3 years ago, Mrs. Viola Liuzzo was brutally murdered in Alabama at the time of the Selma march. The President called for immediate legislation to protect civil rights workers from violence. In April 1965, the House approved a supplemental appropriation of \$50,000 for the Un-American Activities Committee to investigate the Ku Klux Klan. Six months later, in October 1965, the subcommittee began hearing the first of some 187 witnesses. The hearings continued for 4 months until February 1966. Five months later the committee held legislative hearings on the so-called Klan bill.

During the legislative hearings most of the witnesses, including the Attorney General of the United States, expressed grave doubts as to the bill's constitutionality. Civil rights leaders justifiably feared that, rather than protect civil rights workers, the bill's provisions would be used against the civil rights movement.

When the bill was finally reported, toward the end of the 89th Congress, it was too late for action. Three members of the nine-member committee refused to support it. Congressman ICHORD has this to say about a bill which was the product of 40 days of public hearings totaling 14,702 pages and costing thousands of taxpayer dollars:

In sum, I believe the provisions of the bill are not only unenforceable and unconstitutional; they are also so broad and so general that they might cover activities and organizations which do not pose a significant threat to the security of the Nation and the peace and tranquillity of its citizens.

Now, more than a year later, the House has yet to consider this measure.

H.R. 12601 superseding H.R. 10390 was intended to revive an earlier committee measure, the Internal Security Act of 1950, which has been rendered largely inoperative by Supreme Court decisions.

H.R. 12601, relating to registrations under the Subversive Activities Control Board, was the first bill referred to the committee to become law since the 88th Congress. Only six bills in the committee's 30-year history have become law.

The Dirksen bill, the Senate equivalent of H.R. 12601, was properly referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, which also would have been appropriate in the House. Doubts as to its constitutionality were raised by 166 law professors, including nine deans. The Attorney General of the United States declined to affirm his belief in its constitutionality. The law may well meet the fate of the original Internal Security Act, and be declared unconstitutional after years of doing violence to civil liberties.

The final bill referred to the committee last session, H.R. 11675, ironically, would simply abolish the Subversive Activities Control Board. It has not been reported.

These six measures all trespass on the proper jurisdiction of other standing House committees; all are of dubious merit, with the exception of the bill to undo an earlier committee bill by abolishing the Subversive Activities Control Board. The primary sponsors of bills referred to the committee are always members of it. As I stated, many other bills dealing with internal security and the like have been referred to other committees.

Of the six distinct measures considered by the committee last session, one has become law, two are still "in committee," and three have been reported but not yet considered by the House. This is hardly an impressive legislative output for one of the most costly and controversial committees of the House.

The abysmal legislative record of the Un-American Activities Committee is reason enough to deny this appropriation. But in addition to that record, the committee by its conduct during its hearings has discredited the House.

The hearings held in August 1966 were marked by the forceable ejection of an attorney from the hearing room while he was making a point of law. This episode prompted Senator DIRKSEN to comment: "This spectacle can do the Congress no good."

Of the four sets of hearings held in 1967, only one was directed toward legislation.

Hearings on espionage within the United States were held on four occasions during 1967. This should properly be within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee. And in fact, a bill "to strengthen the internal security of the United States," H.R. 15457, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Another committee hearing last August 10 dealt with the incompatibility of communism and Christianity. I wonder how this could possibly result in useful legislation.

Another set of hearings last year dealing with the Subversive Activities Control Board, which would have been better handled by the Judiciary Committee, produced a statute, the dubious constitutionality of which will be tested in the courts for years.

The final hearings by the Un-American Activities Committee considered whether rioting was "planned and instigated by subversive elements." Seven days of testimony condemned communism, but did not conclude that Com-

munists were responsible for the riots, as J. Edgar Hoover stated many months earlier. These hearings were never printed. They produced no legislation. An antiriot measure was reported by the Judiciary Committee. With a Presidential commission studying riots, and the Judiciary Committees in both Chambers considering legislation, what can be the justification for the Un-American Activities Committee action in this area?

One of the most disgraceful hearings of the committee occurred in May 1965, in Chicago. Those hearings were held in the usual carnival manner of the committee. True to its tradition, the names of witnesses were leaked to the press in advance. At the hearings several lawyers were treated with cavalier disrespect. Respected citizens of the community were intimidated and smeared. The Chicago Daily News summed up the hearings in an editorial entitled "Fair Play Went Out the Window":

The three-day visit to Chicago of the House Un-American Activities Committee was a disgrace from start to finish and from hearing room to picket line. Nothing positive was accomplished and a great deal of harm was done.

There was one unintended positive result, however. Dr. Jeremiah Stamler, a physician and Chicago official, declined to testify until the constitutionality of the committee could be established. The Circuit Court of Appeals of the Seventh Circuit has ordered a three-judge court to hear the question of the basic constitutionality of the committee's mandate. A three-judge court was appointed, and on November 8, 1967, unanimously denied the Government's motion to dismiss the action brought against the committee.

This is not merely another contempt case. The direct issue of this committee's constitutionality will be presented.

If we vote for these funds today, what part of them will be used for a useful legislative purpose? We have seen over the years the committee's legislative output is minimal, that its bills belong properly to other committees, and that its hearings are usually used improperly for the purpose of exposure and too often resemble criminal proceedings devoid of due process.

In view of its useless legislative function, its perversion of the hearing procedure, and its characteristic disregard for individual rights, the committee has failed to either earn the right to use public funds or the support of this House of Representatives.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last year I spoke against funding the investigative activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee and was encouraged to note that 43 of my colleagues joined with me to vote against supplying \$350,000 to the committee to continue its questionable practices and procedures which tend to bring this House into disrepute.

Now we are called upon once more to fund the sometimes frivolous and too often corrosive activities of this committee. House Resolution 1042 would authorize \$425,000 for expenditure during this

session of the Congress. This is \$75,000 in excess of what was approved for operating expenses for the committee in 1967.

The reason for requesting this additional appropriation has been given as increased expenditures due to the 1967 and 1968 pay raises, the increase in per diem allowance, the increase in reporters fees, and the general inflationary trend.

It is important to remember, however, that the \$425,000 being requested is in addition to the funds the committee receives automatically and without special resolution under provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Under this authority the House Un-American Activities Committee has received in the past several years over \$100,000 per year. In addition, printing costs for publications issued by the committee are voted separately by the House as the occasion arises.

House Resolution 1042 would, therefore, provide \$425,000 for the House Un-American Activities Committee in addition to the funds already appropriated for the committee under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record. The committee first came into existence in 1938 as a special committee of this House. It continued in that status until 1945, when it became a permanent standing committee. During its tenure as a special committee it was authorized \$720,000 for investigative activity. In the 23 years since its institution as a standing committee, it has been authorized \$6,190,195 for the purposes of investigation.

And what do we have to show for the more than \$6 million which has been expended? We have five laws of any importance which can be said to have originated from this committee. Of these, the most well known is the Internal Security Act of 1950, which, let it be noted, was passed over the veto of President Truman, who denounced it as a "loosely dangerous" intrusion of the constitutional privilege of free speech.

We have also an unparalleled issuance of contempt-of-Congress citations, handed out by the committee to anyone audacious enough to refuse his cooperation with the committee. The record shows, as reported in the authoritative Congressional Quarterly reports, that between 1946 and 1964, 170 citations were ordered by the House of Representatives. Of this total, 160 originated with the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I think this is a very significant statistic, and I urge my colleagues to reflect on its meaning, which is this: of all the committees of the House, it is this committee which most earns the disrespect of witnesses called before it. In consequence, the committee then dispenses contempt citations as if they were traffic tickets.

And to what end? It is true that in 1946 and 1947, 33 of 34 citations issued by the committee resulted in convictions. However, between 1950 and 1966, only nine convictions resulted from the 133 contempt citations issued by the committee. This constitutes more of a laughingstock than anything else.

In addition, the purpose to which this committee is dedicated is of very serious consequence. Under rule XI of the House, the House Un-American Activities Committee is authorized to investigate the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States and the diffusion of such propaganda activities in the United States. In effect, the committee conducts hearings into the opinions and ideas which people hold. Former President Truman has rightly observed in his memoirs:

In a free country, we punish men for the crimes they commit but never for the opinions they have.

Over the years it has become apparent that the investigations conducted by the committee have come dangerously close to curtailing our freedom of speech and press guarantees contained in the first amendment to the United States Constitution. In the Watkins decision of 1957, the Supreme Court noted:

An investigation is subject to the command that the Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech or press or assembly.

The Court further stated:

Abuses of the investigative process may imperceptibly lead to abridgment of protected freedoms. The mere summoning of a witness and compelling him to testify, against his will, about his beliefs, expressions or associations is a measure of governmental interference. And when those forced revelations concern matters that are unorthodox, unpopular, or even hateful to the general public, the reaction in the life of the witness may be disastrous.

We all know the circus atmosphere that too often surrounds the hearings held by this committee. In my own city of Chicago, for instance, hearings were held by this committee which were referred to by our distinguished mayor, the Honorable Richard J. Daley, as a "star-chamber proceeding." Msgr. George G. Higgins, director of the social action department of the U.S. Catholic Conference, in the Chicago archdiocesan newspaper *New World*, referred to the committee as useless and one which despotically denied the rights of American citizens. He wrote:

Its procedure is one by which friendly witnesses are allowed to defame others without being subjected to cross-examination and by which those defamed are then subpoenaed and required to answer committee questions but are not allowed to testify in their own behalf or to have others testify for them.

We know, too, that witnesses are sometimes paid to come before the committee, and I think it highly irregular that they be paid a sum of money for making an appearance.

It is highly questionable whether the committee serves any serious purpose other than exposure. During the 89th Congress only 12 bills were referred to it and it reported only three measures, none of which were passed by the Congress.

So much is being said today about money for both guns and butter, and the money being spent on the House Un-American Activities Committee is one of those unnecessary expenses that should be eliminated. I am hoping that the House will apply the knife, because the

work of the House Un-American Activities Committee can be done by the Judiciary Committee if there is any work to be done.

I am as interested as any of my colleagues in routing the Reds, and in fact, led the cleanup in 1947 on the Illinois State Industrial Union Council in Chicago when five of six places on the executive board of the central CIO body, representing 275,000 Illinois workers, went to avowed anti-Communists.

I cannot, however, agree in good conscience with the unfair tactics employed by the House Un-American Activities Committee, the most recent of which that comes to mind being the Dr. Jeremiah Stamler case.

Therefore, when the first session of the 90th Congress convened in January 1967, I introduced legislation, along with over 30 of my colleagues, calling for the discontinuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the transfer of its duties and responsibilities to the House Judiciary Committee. I still believe this an advisable course of action and look forward to the day a majority in the House agrees with me.

Twice now, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California, Hon. DON EDWARDS, has obtained a vote on his motion to recommit the monetary authorization of the committee until such time as hearings are held to determine the justification for funds being given to it. In 1965, 58 Members of the House voted for this motion; in 1967, 92 voted for it. This House would be well advised to conduct such hearings and to gain the opinion of intelligent and informed persons on the need, if any, for this committee.

In view of the fact that the House Un-American Activities Committee has accomplished little during the years of its existence, the fact that its unruly hearings and misuse of public funds through the practice of paying witnesses without identifying their names in the public record, the fact that it has come dangerously close to curtailing our first amendment freedoms of speech and press, and in view of the fact that inflation and increasing costs are the concern of the committee, then certainly it would be in the best interests of our Government to discontinue the House Un-American Activities Committee and transfer its duties to the Judiciary Committee, rather than authorize the payment of \$425,000 being requested today.

I urge my colleagues to withhold the requested funds from this committee, and I urge the defeat of House Resolution 1042.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I have quite a few requests for time, but the Members will all repeat what they have said in previous years.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask that all Members be allowed 5 days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EDWARDS of California moves to recommit the resolution (H. Res. 1042) to the Committee on House Administration with instructions that an open hearing be held on the justification for such additional funds to the House Committee on Un-American Activities as provided in House Resolution 1042.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 78, nays 305, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS 78

Adams	Gonzalez	O'Hara, Ill.
Addabbo	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Mich.
Annunzio	Gude	Olsen
Barrett	Halpern	Ottinger
Elatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Patten
Bolling	Hathaway	Podell
Brasco	Hawkins	Rees
Burke, Mass.	Hechler, W. Va.	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Helstoski	Reuss
Button	Hicks	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Holland	Rodino
Cohelan	Horton	Ronan
Conte	Howard	Rosenthal
Corman	Joelson	Roybal
Daddario	Karsten	Ryan
Derwinski	Karth	St Germain
Diggs	Kastenmeier	Schwengel
Dow	Kupferman	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Calif.	Leggett	Tiernan
Ellberg	Long, Md.	Tunney
Felberstein	McCarthy	Van Deerlin
Forley	Matsunaga	Waldie
Ford	Meeds	Whalen
William D.	Mink	Wolf
Fraser	Moorhead	Yates
Gallagher	Nedzi	
Gilbert	Nix	

NAYS 305

Abbott	Andrews	Battin
Abnerthy	N. Dak.	Belcher
Adair	Arends	Bell
Albert	Ashbrook	Bennett
Anderson, Ill.	Ashmore	Betts
Anderson	Aspinall	Bevill
Tenn.	Ayres	Blester
Andrews, Ala.	Bates	Blackburn

Blanton	Hamilton	Poff
Boggs	Hammer-	Pollock
Boland	schmidt	Pool
Boiton	Hanley	Price, Ill.
Bow	Hanna	Price, Tex.
Brademas	Hansen, Idaho	Pryor
Bray	Hardy	Pucinski
Brinkley	Harrison	Purcell
Brock	Harsha	Quie
Brooks	Hébert	Quillen
Broomfield	Heckler, Mass.	Rallsback
Brotzman	Henderson	Randall
Brown, Mich.	Hull	Rarick
Brown, Ohio	Hungate	Reid, Ill.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hunt	Reifel
Broyhill, Va.	Hutchinson	Rhinecke
Buchanan	Ichord	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burke, Fla.	Irwin	Riegle
Burleson	Jacobs	Rivers
Burton, Utah	Jarman	Roberts
Bush	Johnson, Calif.	Robison
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Rogers, Colo.
Cabell	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Cahill	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, N.Y.
Carter	Jones, Mo.	Rooney, Pa.
Casey	Jones, N.C.	Rostenkowski
Cederberg	Kazen	Roudebush
Chamberlain	Kee	Roush
Clancy	Keith	Rumsfeld
Clark	King, N.Y.	Rumpe
Cleveland	Kirwan	Sandman
Collier	Kleppe	Satterfield
Colmer	Kluczynski	Saylor
Conable	Kornegay	Schadeberg
Corbett	Kuykendall	Scherle
Cowger	Kyl	Schneebeli
Cramer	Kyros	Schweiker
Culver	Laird	Scott
Cunningham	Landrum	Shibley
Curtis	Langen	Shriver
Daniels	Latta	Sikes
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Sisk
Davis, Wis.	Lipscomb	Skubitz
Delaney	Lloyd	Slack
Dellenback	Lukens	Smith, Calif.
Denney	McClory	Smith, Iowa
Dent	McCloskey	Smith, N.Y.
Devine	McClure	Smith, Okla.
Dickinson	McCulloch	Snyder
Dingell	McDade	Springer
Dole	McDonald,	Stafford
Donohue	Mich.	Staggers
Dorn	McFall	Stanton
Downing	McMillan	Steed
Dulski	MacGregor	Steiger, Ariz.
Duncan	Machen	Steiger, Wis.
Dwyer	Madden	Stephens
Edmondson	Mahon	Stratton
Edwards, La.	Marsh	Stubblefield
Erlenborn	Martin	Stuckey
Esch	Mathias, Md.	Sullivan
Eshleman	May	Taft
Evans, Colo.	Mayne	Talcott
Everett	Meskill	Taylor
Evins, Tenn.	Michel	Teague, Calif.
Fascell	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, Ga.
Feighan	Miller, Ohio	Thomson, Wis.
Findley	Mills	Tuck
Fino	Minish	Udall
Fisher	Minshall	Ullman
Flood	Mize	Vander Jagt
Flynt	Monagan	Vigorito
Ford, Gerald R.	Montgomery	Waggonner
Fountain	Moore	Walker
Frelinghuysen	Morgan	Wampler
Friedel	Morris, N. Mex.	Watkins
Fulton, Pa.	Morton	Watson
Fulton, Tenn.	Mosher	Whalley
Fuqua	Moss	White
Gardner	Murphy, Ill.	Whitener
Garmatz	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitten
Gathings	Myers	Wildnall
Gettys	Natcher	Williams, Pa.
Gibbons	Nelsen	Willis
Goodell	O'Konski	Wilson, Bob
Goodling	O'Neal, Ga.	Winn
Gray	O'Neill, Mass.	Wright
Griffiths	Passman	Wyatt
Gross	Perkins	Wylder
Grover	Pettis	Wyllie
Gubser	Philbin	Wyman
Gurney	Pickle	Young
Haley	Pike	Zablocki
Hall	Pirnie	Zion
Halleck	Poage	Zwach

NOT VOTING 49

Clausen,	Eckhardt
Don H.	Edwards, Ala.
Clawson, Del	Fallon
Conyers	Galifianakis
Dawson	Gialmo
de la Garza	Green, Oreg.
Dowdy	Hagan

Harvey	Mailliard	Selden
Hays	Mathias, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Herlong	Morse, Mass.	Tenzer
Hollfield	Nichols	Utt
Hosmer	Patman	Vanik
Kelly	Pelly	Watts
King, Calif.	Pepper	Wiggins
Long, La.	Resnick	Wilson,
McEwen	Roth	Charles H.
Macdonald,	St. Onge	
Mass.	Scheuer	

Dickinson	Kelly	Rhodes, Pa.
Dole	King, N.Y.	Riegle
Donohue	Kirwan	Rivers
Dorn	Kleppe	Roberts
Downing	Kluczynski	Robison
Dulski	Kornegay	Rodino
Duncan	Kyl	Rogers, Colo.
Dwyer	Kyros	Rogers, Fla.
Edmondson	Lalrd	Rooney, N.Y.
Edwards, Ala.	Langen	Rooney, Pa.
Edwards, La.	Latta	Rostenkowski
Erlenborn	Lennon	Roudebush
Esch	Lipcomb	Roush
Eshleman	Lloyd	Rumsfeld
Evans, Colo.	Lukens	Ruppe
Everett	McClary	Sandman
Evins, Tenn.	McCloskey	Satterfield
Feighan	McClure	Saylor
Findley	McCulloch	Schadeberg
Fino	McDade	Scherle
Fisher	McDonald,	Schneebell
Flood	Mich.	Schweiker
Flynt	McFall	Schwengel
Foley	McMillan	Scott
Ford, Gerald R.	Macdonald,	Shipley
Ford,	Mass.	Shriver
William D.	MacGregor	Sikes
Fountain	Machen	Sikes
Frelinghuysen	Madden	Sisk
Friedel	Mahon	Skubitz
Fulton, Pa.	Marsh	Slack
Fulton, Tenn.	Martin	Smith, Calif.
Fuqua	Mathias, Md.	Smith, Iowa
Gardner	Matunaga	Smith, N.Y.
Garmatz	May	Smith, Okla.
Gathings	Mayne	Snyder
Gettys	Meeds	Springer
Gibbons	Meskill	Stafford
Goodell	Michel	Staggers
Goodling	Miller, Calif.	Stanton
Gray	Miller, Ohio	Steed
Griffiths	Mills	Steiger, Ariz.
Gross	Minish	Steiger, Wis.
Grover	Minshall	Stephens
Gubser	Mize	Stratton
Gude	Monagan	Stubblefield
Gurney	Montgomery	Stuckey
Haley	Moore	Sullivan
Hall	Moorhead	Taft
Halleck	Morgan	Talcott
Halpern	Morris, N. Mex.	Taylor
Hamilton	Morton	Teague, Calif.
Hammer-	Mosher	Thompson, Ga.
schmidt	Moss	Thomson, Wis.
Hanley	Murphy, Ill.	Tiernan
Hanna	Murphy, N.Y.	Tuck
Hansen, Idaho	Myers	Tunney
Hansen, Wash.	Natcher	Udall
Hardy	Nelsen	Ullman
Harrison	O'Hara, Mich.	Van Deerlin
Harsha	O'Konski	Vander Jagt
Hathaway	Olsen	Vigorito
Hébert	O'Neal, Ga.	Waggonner
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill, Mass.	Waldie
Heckler, Mass.	Passman	Walker
Henderson	Patten	Wampler
Hicks	Perkins	Watkins
Holland	Pettis	Watson
Horton	Philbin	Whalen
Howard	Pickle	Whalley
Hull	Pike	White
Hungate	Pirnie	Whitener
Hunt	Poage	Whitten
Hutchinson	Poff	Widnall
Ichord	Pollock	Wiggins
Irwin	Price, Ill.	Williams, Pa.
Jacobs	Price, Tex.	Willis
Jarman	Pryor	Wilson, Bob
Joelson	Pucinski	Winn
Johnson, Calif.	Quie	Wolff
Johnson, Pa.	Quillen	Wright
Jonas	Railsback	Wyatt
Jones, Ala.	Randall	Wydler
Jones, Mo.	Rarick	Wyllie
Jones, N.C.	Reid, Ill.	Wyman
Karsten	Reifel	Young
Kazen	Reinecke	Zablocki
Kee	Rhodes, Ariz.	Zion
Keith		Zwach

NAYS 44

Annunzio	Fraser
Ashley	Gallagher
Barrett	Gilbert
Bolling	Gonzalez
Brasco	Green, Pa.
Burton, Calif.	Hawkins
Button	Helstoski
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield
Cohelan	Karth
Diggs	Kastenmeier
Dingell	Kupferman
Dow	Long, Md.
Edwards, Calif.	McCarthy
Eilberg	Mink
Farbstein	Nedzi

Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Ottlinger
Podell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Ronan
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Yates

NOT VOTING 44

Berry	Hagan	Patman
Bingham	Harvey	Pelly
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Pepper
Celler	Herlong	Purcell
Clawson, Del	Hosmer	Resnick
Conyers	King, Calif.	Roth
Dawson	Kuykendall	St. Onge
de la Garza	Landrum	Scheuer
Dowdy	Leggett	Selden
Eckhardt	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Fallon	McEwen	Utt
Fascell	Mailliard	Vanik
Galifianakis	Mathias, Calif.	Watts
Gialmo	Morse, Mass.	Wilson,
Green, Oreg.	Nichols	Charles H.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Bingham against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Selden for, with Mr. Scheuer against.
Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Patman with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Vanik.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Ashley with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. LONG of Maryland changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Resolution 1042, just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

IRREGULAR, UNSCHEDULED, OVERTIME DIFFERENTIAL FOR POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1085 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1085

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14933) to modify certain provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to hours of work and overtime for certain employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mrs. Kelly against.
Mr. Bingham for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Fallon against.
Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.

Mr. Scheuer for, with Mr. Selden against.
Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Carey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Berry.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Mathias of California.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Roth.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hagan.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts and Mr. CONTE changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 343, nays 44, not voting 44,

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS 343

Abbott	Blatnik	Cederberg
Abernethy	Boggs	Chamberlain
Adair	Boland	Clancy
Adams	Bolton	Clark
Addabbo	Bow	Clausen,
Albert	Brademas	Don H.
Anderson, Ill.	Bray	Cleveland
Anderson,	Brinkley	Collier
Tenn.	Brock	Colmer
Andrews, Ala.	Brooks	Conable
Andrews,	Broomfield	Conte
N. Dak.	Brotzman	Corbett
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Corman
Ashbrook	Brown, Ohio	Cowger
Ashmore	Broyhill, N.C.	Cramer
Aspinall	Broyhill, Va.	Culver
Ayres	Buchanan	Cunningham
Baring	Burke, Fla.	Daddario
Bates	Burke, Mass.	Daniels
Battin	Burleson	Davis, Ga.
Belcher	Burton, Utah	Davis, Wis.
Bell	Bush	Delaney
Bennett	Byrnes, Wis.	Dellenback
Betts	Cabell	Denney
Bevill	Cahill	Dent
Blester	Carey	Derwinski
Blackburn	Carter	Devine
Blanton	Casey	

to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTAL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy on the rule before us. It is an open rule, providing for 1 hour of debate.

Therefore, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LATTAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is: First, to authorize the Postmaster General to provide premium pay on an annual basis at an appropriate percentage of basic compensation for certain postal field service employees, such as postal inspectors, who occupy positions in which the hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively, and which require substantial amounts of irregular, unscheduled, overtime duty and duty at night, on Sundays, and on holidays, with the employee being responsible for recognizing circumstances which require him to remain on duty; second, the legislation also changes the method of computing the basic compensation of postal inspectors from a 6-day-week basis to a 5-day-week basis by changing the present 312-day-per-year basis to a 260-day basis.

The provisions will not apply to postmasters; employees in salary levels PFS-16 and above, or to employees covered by section 3581 of title 39, United States Code, which prescribes a method of paying overtime for employees assigned to road duty.

The premium pay to be provided will be on an annual basis under conditions established by the Postmaster General in lieu of any other premium pay. The amount of the premium pay is to be determined by the Postmaster General, as an appropriate percentage of not less than 10 percent nor more than 25 percent of such part of the employees compensation as does not exceed the maximum pay step for salary level PFS-11.

Also, the premium pay may be paid to such an employee only to the extent that the payment does not cause the aggregate rate of compensation for any pay period to exceed the maximum rate of salary level PFS-18.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 3575(a) of title 39, United States Code, to grant the Postmaster General authority to exclude certain employees in regional offices in salary levels PFS-15 and below from the provisions of section 3571, relating to maximum hours of work; section 3573, relating to compen-

satory time, overtime, and holidays; and section 3574, relating to night work.

Under the existing provisions of section 3575(a) postmasters, rural carriers, postal inspectors, and employees in salary levels PFS-16 and above, are exempted from the provisions of such three sections. The purpose of this change is to add authority for the Postmaster General to exempt such employees in the regional offices in salary levels PFS-15 and below as he may designate.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 3541(d) of title 39, United States Code, to remove "postal inspectors" from the application of paragraphs 3 and 4.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of subsection (d) prescribe the method of computing the daily rate of basic compensation for postal employees.

Paragraph 3 requires that the annual rate of compensation shall be divided by 312, to compute the daily rate for postmasters in fourth class post offices, postal inspectors, and rural carriers—other than substitute rural carriers. The amendment will remove postal inspectors from this method of computation.

Paragraph 4 provides that the hourly rate of basic compensation shall be multiplied by the number of daily hours of service required to compute the daily rate of basic compensation for annual rate employees other than postmasters, postal inspectors, and rural carriers. The amendment will subject postal inspectors to the provisions of paragraph 4.

The salaries of employees throughout the postal field service generally are computed on the basis of a 5-day workweek. The daily rate of compensation for such employees is computed by dividing the annual rate by 260-day employment basis.

The salaries of postal inspectors under existing law are computed on the basis of a 6-day workweek. Paragraph 3, referred to above, requires that the daily rate of compensation for postal inspectors be computed by dividing the present annual rate of basic compensation by 312-day employment basis.

Section 3 of the bill has the effect of changing the method of computing the daily rate of compensation of postal inspectors by dividing the annual rate of basic compensation by 260 instead of 312. The proposed change will be in accord with the general 40-hour workweek policy.

The cost of this legislation estimated by the Post Office Department, assuming that all eligible employees will qualify for a full 25-percent differential, and using the rates of compensation in postal field service schedule II, which will become effective July 1, 1968, to be \$4,369,000.

There are no minority views.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14933) to modify certain provi-

sions of title 39, United States Code, relating to hours of work and overtime for certain employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14933, with Mr. SMITH of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14933 is a bill which I introduced on the basis of an official request of the Postmaster General. It was supported unanimously in my Subcommittee on Postal Operations and there were no opposing votes in the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. One member of the full committee announced his intention to offer an amendment on the floor which would restrict the coverage of the bill.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Postmaster General in his discretion to provide a premium overtime differential, on an annual basis at an appropriate percentage of basic compensation, for certain postal field service employees. The employees who will benefit by this bill are those who the Postmaster General determines hold positions in which the length of the hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively. The employees expected to be covered by this bill work long, irregular, unscheduled hours, at night, on Sundays and holidays, in situations where the employee himself is responsible for recognizing the need to remain on duty. At the present time this type of employee generally works over 50 hours a week.

The legislation also changes the method of computing the basic compensation of postal inspectors from a 6-day-week basis to a 5-day-week basis, by changing the present 312-days-per-year ratio to a 260-day basis.

EXCLUSIONS

This bill specifically prohibits application to:

First. Postmasters;

Second. Employees referred to in section 3581 of title 39, relating to road duty employees of the postal transportation service and the motor vehicle service; and

Third. Employees in salary levels PFS-16 and above.

STATEMENT

H.R. 14933 will remedy a defect in existing law which at present is inadequate

with respect to equal overtime treatment for employees in certain positions in the postal field service. Under the bill the Postmaster General must determine that the position of the particular employee requires him to perform irregular and unscheduled overtime. There are three major groups who are expected to be covered: First, postal inspectors; second, real estate officers; and third, postal service officers. Today there are 1,130 postal inspectors and the average workweek is 53.4 hours per week. There are 308 postal service officers who have a workweek of 56.4 hours, and 92 real estate officers who have an average workweek of over 50 hours. Two real estate officers in my district of the Philadelphia region averaged 69 hours per week during a recent accounting period.

POSTAL INSPECTORS

Postal inspectors are special representatives of the Postmaster General. They are members of the enforcement arm of the Department, and they are responsible for auditing, and inspection activities within the Department as well. Where a crime occurs or a catastrophe affecting the mail, postal personnel, or the postal service, inspectors must be on the job, and stay on the job until it is completed.

POSTAL SERVICE OFFICERS

Postal service officers are troubleshooters for the regional offices of the Post Office Department. Their basic job is to travel in a specific area and expedite the transportation and the handling of the mail. This job is basically a production and efficiency job. Less than 1 percent of their time is spent on public relations. In our overloaded mail system that delivers more mail than all of the postal departments of the world combined, this troubleshooting job is a key position.

REAL ESTATE OFFICERS

Real estate officers have to negotiate with bidders for acquisition of property through leases, rental agreements, assignable land options or purchase agreements. Surveys of real estate must be conducted by these men, as well as the appraisal of land. Much of the employee's activity is confined to night duty. He must meet with owners, city developers, planning commissions, boards of zoning appeals, and similar groups which normally only meet in the evening.

The work these men do cannot be controlled administratively. It is emergency and do-it-now work. They are among the responsible employees in the postal field service.

Under existing provisions of 39 United States Code 3573, most postal field service employees in salary levels PFS-11 and below are entitled to overtime compensation for work in excess of 8 hours a day, or for work in excess of 40 hours a week. Under this bill the Postmaster General will be provided with the discretion to prescribe an annual premium pay differential for those employees of the postal field service whose duties as unsupervised employees precluded them from sharing the benefits of the present premium pay system.

COST

The Post Office Department estimates that the annual cost of this legislation would be \$4,369,000, assuming that approximately 1,430 eligible employees will qualify for a full 25-percent differential, and using the rates of compensation in postal field service schedule II, which will become effective July 1, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 205, Public Law 90-206.

The premium pay to be provided will be on an annual basis under conditions established by the Postmaster General in lieu of any other premium pay. The amount of the premium pay is to be determined by the Postmaster General, as an appropriate percentage of not less than 10 percent nor more than 25 percent of such part of the employee's compensation as does not exceed the maximum pay step for salary level PFS-11. In addition, the premium pay may not cause the employee's aggregate rate of compensation for any pay period to exceed the maximum rate of salary level PFS-18.

CONCLUSION

This bill corrects an inequity. It provides a premium pay differential in lieu of overtime compensation for those employees who have to work in emergencies or circumstances that require them to work alone without supervision. A postal inspector trailing a criminal, a postal service employee removing a mail bottleneck, or a real estate officer working with a local city council must work under uncontrollable circumstances. This bill gives these people the same rights that other Government employees have. Postal employees under the postal pay system should be removed from this inequitable situation.

IRREGULAR WORK SCHEDULES POSTAL INSPECTORS

There are 1,030 postal inspectors in PFS levels 10-15, and 94 in PFS levels 16-20. The breakdown by levels that would be covered by this legislation is—

	Employees
PFS-10	76
PFS-12	152
PFS-13	235
PFS-14	306
PFS-15	261

Employees in PFS-16 and above, not covered by the legislation, are—

	Employees
PFS-16	40
PFS-17	18
PFS-18	15
PFS-19	15
PFS-20	16

Average workweek: 53.4 hours per week.

I include the following release from the Post Office Information Service:

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien today lauded the Postal Inspectors for the 62 per cent increase in mail fraud arrests in the first half of the 1968 fiscal year, in opening the four-day Washington conference of the Service's 58 top fraud specialists.

"With the great majority of these promoters preying upon the consumer, the 548 arrests in the first six months of this fiscal year reflect the significant contribution you are making to President Johnson's drive against fraudulent and deceptive business practices," Mr. O'Brien said. There were 338 arrests in the same period in 1966.

The Postmaster General said that the sharp increases in arrests not only reflected improved enforcement techniques, but that the American consumer is becoming better informed. In the past five years, Mr. O'Brien said, the number of fraud complaints from consumers has climbed from 83,000 a year to 135,000 last year, an increase of 53 per cent.

"The low-income consumer," Mr. O'Brien said, "is a primary target for mail fraud schemes which are costing Americans some \$500 million a year. Those hard pressed to meet present needs are particularly vulnerable to dishonest home improvement contractors, chain-referral selling schemes, fraudulent debt consolidators, and medical frauds."

The Chief Postal Inspector, Henry B. Montague, said that "the Department is adding 10 men to its staff of 110 fraud specialists, because of the increased number of complaints."

"The savings to the American consumer is many times the costs of investigative time used in fraud cases," Mr. Montague added that the convictions in just one chain-referral operation in August, 1967, halted a promotion which had already taken \$110 million from the consumer—40 times more than we spent in combating mail fraud schemes last year.

Timothy J. May, the Post Office Department's General Counsel, said "We are hopeful that the Congress will strengthen this year the civil postal fraud statute (Title 39, U.S.C., Section 4005) by eliminating the need to prove that the promoter intended to defraud."

"Because the civil statute, as contrasted with the criminal one, seeks to prevent the illegal promoter from receiving remittances through the mail, rather than punishing him with a fine and prison sentence, we feel that the Department should only have to prove that the promoter is seeking funds through the mail and that his claims have been found to be false."

Mr. May added that "the burden of having to prove intent is critical because under the civil statute we do not have subpoena power—which is often essential to gathering evidence that the promoter intended to defraud."

The other speakers today included Frederick C. Belen, Deputy Postmaster General, and Chief Judge Roszel C. Thomsen, U.S. Federal Court, District of Maryland.

Tomorrow the fraud specialists will be addressed by Attorney General Ramsey Clark, Fred M. Vinson, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, Nathaniel E. Kossack, Criminal Division of Justice, Herbert Edelhertz, Chief of the Fraud Section in the Criminal Division at Justice, and William A. Duvall, Acting Judicial Officer and Chief Hearing Examiner at the Post Office Department.

The speakers on Wednesday will include A. Harris Kenyon, of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and Frank C. Hale, Federal Trade Commission.

On Thursday three executives from the National Better Business Bureau in New York will address the conference. They are Kenneth B. Willson, President, and Van Miller and Irving Ladimer, both Vice Presidents. Other speakers will include Douglas Tindal, Managing Director of the Better Business Bureau of Washington.

POSTAL SERVICE OFFICERS

There are 308 postal service officers divided by levels, as follows:

	Employees
Level 15	125
Level 14	111
Level 12	62
Level 10	10

Total ----- 308
Average workweek: 56.4 hours per week.

These employees are the traveling representatives of the regional directors, and are responsible in an assigned area for taking whatever action may be necessary to expedite the transportation and the handling of the mail. They are responsible for furnishing the operational guidelines to employees of postal installations and contract carriers within their area.

These officers currently are not paid any overtime compensation or night differential. Such benefits could be extended to these employees under existing law. Should it become necessary to pay overtime at time and one-half, it would be much more costly than to pay the 25-percent differential under the proposed legislation.

Statistical information from the Post Office follows:

Postal service officers, analysis of work performed during fiscal year 1967 based on workload statistics

Activities	Percent of total time
Mail handling.....	38.38
Collection and delivery.....	8.76
Mail movement.....	14.30
Followup on inspection reports.....	2.93
Establish and discontinue post offices, branches, and stations.....	1.79
Space and equipment needs (includes processing forms 73).....	.72
Appraisal of postmasters (only when specifically assigned).....	.22
Training postmasters.....	2.30
Patron and community relations (includes dedications).....	.90
Department and region programs.....	3.18
General administration, planning and attending meetings (includes time spent writing reports and answering inquiries).....	17.70
Travel (does not include 45% of travel during non-duty hours).....	8.50
Routine visits to 2d, 3d, and 4th-class post offices.....	.32
Total	100.00

Total hours for 300 Postal Service officers during fiscal year 1967.....	796,250
Average per man.....	2,654
Weeks worked (allowing 4 weeks for sick and annual leave—a low estimate).....	48
Average duty hours per man per week.....	56.4

Why Postal Service officers can't be fitted into 40-hour week:

Early morning (5-6 AM) peak mail receipts and evening (7-9 PM) peak mail dispatches are covered.

Weekend coverage of mail handling.

Travel between post offices before or after peak mail handling observations.

Output would be reduced 28%.

Approximately 90 additional Postal Service officers would be needed to maintain current output.

If postal inspectors get premium pay, we will be obligated to pay overtime to Postal Service officers—far more costly than proposed premium pay.

POSTAL SERVICE OFFICERS

Region and domicile	Positions	
	Level	Number
Atlanta.....		19
Greensboro, N.C.....	15	1
Raleigh, N.C.....	15	1
Greenville, S.C.....	15	1
Augusta, Ga.....	15	1

POSTAL SERVICE OFFICERS—Continued

Region and domicile	Positions	
	Level	Number
Atlanta—Continued.....		
Tallahassee, Fla.....	15	1
Orlando, Fla.....	15	1
Miami, Fla.....	15	1
West Palm Beach, Fla.....	15	1
Atlanta, Ga.....	15	1
Fayetteville, N.C.....	14	1
Atlanta, Ga.....	14	2
Macon, Ga.....	14	1
Savannah, Ga.....	14	1
Asheville, N.C.....	14	1
Charleston, S.C.....	12	1
Albany, Ga.....	12	1
Atlanta, Ga.....	12	1
Do.....	10	1
Boston.....		29
Woburn, Mass.....	15	1
Providence, R.I.....	15	1
Framingham, Mass.....	15	1
White River Junction, Vt.....	15	1
Rutland, Vt.....	15	1
Portsmouth, N.H.....	15	1
Portland, Maine.....	15	1
New Haven, Conn.....	15	1
Hartford, Conn.....	15	1
Boston, Mass.....	14	1
Lynn, Mass.....	14	1
Brockton, Mass.....	14	2
Providence, R.I.....	14	1
Worcester, Mass.....	14	1
Manchester, N.H.....	14	1
Augusta, Maine.....	14	1
Waterville, Maine.....	14	1
Bangor, Maine.....	14	1
New London, Conn.....	14	1
New Haven, Conn.....	14	1
Boston, Mass.....	12	2
Springfield, Mass.....	12	2
White River Junction, Vt.....	12	1
Concord, N.H.....	12	1
Stamford, Conn.....	12	1
Boston, Mass.....	10	1
Chicago.....		19
Rock Island, Ill.....	15	1
Peoria, Ill.....	15	1
Springfield, Ill.....	15	1
Royal Oak, Mich.....	15	1
Lansing, Mich.....	15	1
Grand Rapids, Mich.....	15	1
Flint, Mich.....	15	1
Chicago, Ill.....	14	2
Centralia, Ill.....	14	1
Kalamazoo, Mich.....	14	1
Chicago, Ill.....	14	4
East St. Louis, Ill.....	14	1
Detroit, Mich.....	14	1
Escanaba, Mich.....	14	1
Chicago, Ill.....	10	1
Cincinnati.....		23
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	15	2
Columbus, Ohio.....	15	1
Marion, Ohio.....	15	1
Fort Wayne, Ind.....	15	1
Indianapolis, Ind.....	15	1
Evansville, Ind.....	15	1
Louisville, Ky.....	15	1
Owensboro, Ky.....	15	1
Akron, Ohio.....	15	1
Toledo, Ohio.....	14	1
Gary, Ind.....	14	1
Terre Haute, Ind.....	14	1
Bowling Green, Ky.....	14	1
Lexington, Ky.....	14	1
Ashland, Ky.....	14	1
South Bend, Ind.....	14	1
Zanesville, Ohio.....	14	1
Chillicothe, Ohio.....	12	1
Muncie, Ind.....	12	1
Corbin, Ky.....	12	1
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	10	2
Dallas.....		19
Amarillo, Tex.....	15	1
San Antonio, Tex.....	15	1
Houston, Tex.....	15	1
Shreveport, La.....	15	1
Denton, Tex.....	15	1
Dallas, Tex.....	15	1
Waco, Tex.....	14	1
Corpus Christi, Tex.....	14	1
Baton Rouge, La.....	14	1
Lake Charles, La.....	14	1
Longview, Tex.....	14	1
Bryan, Tex.....	14	1
McAllen, Tex.....	14	1
Dallas, Tex.....	12	2
Do.....	12	1
Abilene, Tex.....	12	1
Alexandria, La.....	12	1
Beaumont, Tex.....	12	1

POSTAL SERVICE OFFICERS—Continued

Region and domicile	Positions	
	Level	Number
Denver.....		13
Denver, Colo.....	15	1
Grand Junction, Colo.....	15	1
Cheyenne, Wyo.....	15	1
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	15	1
Phoenix, Ariz.....	15	2
Denver, Colo.....	14	1
Casper, Wyo.....	14	1
Flagstaff, Ariz.....	14	1
Albuquerque, N. Mex.....	14	1
Pueblo, Colo.....	12	1
Denver, Colo.....	10	2
Memphis.....		17
Memphis, Tenn.....	15	1
Chattanooga, Tenn.....	15	1
Mobile, Ala.....	15	1
Meridian, Miss.....	15	1
Birmingham, Ala.....	15	1
Memphis, Tenn.....	14	2
Jackson, Miss.....	14	1
Gulfport, Miss.....	14	1
Decatur, Ala.....	14	1
Knoxville, Tenn.....	14	1
Selma, Ala.....	14	1
Montgomery, Ala.....	14	1
Birmingham, Ala.....	14	1
Columbus, Miss.....	14	1
Nashville, Tenn.....	12	1
Cookeville, Tenn.....	12	1
Minneapolis.....		19
Minneapolis, Minn.....	15	2
St. Cloud, Minn.....	15	1
Milwaukee, Wis.....	15	2
Madison, Wis.....	15	1
Green Bay, Wis.....	15	1
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.....	15	1
Minneapolis, Minn.....	14	1
St. Paul, Minn.....	14	1
Eau Claire, Wis.....	14	1
Fargo, N. Dak.....	14	1
Rapid City, S. Dak.....	14	1
Willmar, Minn.....	14	1
Bismarck, N. Dak.....	14	1
Wausau, Wis.....	14	1
Minneapolis, Minn.....	12	1
Mankato, Minn.....	12	1
Duluth, Minn.....	12	1
New York.....		23
Bay Shore, N.Y.....	15	1
Poughkeepsie, N.Y.....	15	1
Utica, N.Y.....	15	1
Syracuse, N.Y.....	15	1
Brooklyn (Long Island Terminal).....	15	1
New York, N.Y.....	15	2
Glens Falls, N.Y.....	14	1
Watertown, N.Y.....	14	1
San Juan, P.R.....	14	1
New York, N.Y.....	14	6
Do.....	12	5
Do.....	10	2
Philadelphia.....		29
Bradford, Pa.....	15	1
Uniontown, Pa.....	15	1
State College, Pa.....	15	1
Scranton, Pa.....	15	1
Lehigh Valley, Pa.....	15	1
Lancaster, Pa.....	15	1
Paoli, Pa.....	15	1
Norristown, Pa.....	15	1
Doylestown, Pa.....	15	1
Philadelphia, Pa.....	15	1
Dover, Del.....	15	1
Camden, N.J.....	15	1
Trenton, N.J.....	15	1
Hackensack, N.J.....	15	1
Newark, N.J.....	15	1
Summit, N.J.....	15	1
New Castle, Pa.....	14	1
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	14	1
Greensburg, Pa.....	14	1
Camden, N.J.....	14	1
Lakewood, N.J.....	14	1
New Brunswick, N.J.....	14	1
Philadelphia, Pa.....	14	1
Johnstown, Pa.....	12	1
Altoona, Pa.....	12	1
Harrisburg, Pa.....	12	1
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.....	12	1
Red Bank, N.J.....	12	1
Dover, N.J.....	12	1
St. Louis.....		21
St. Louis, Mo.....	15	1
Springfield, Mo.....	15	1
Farmington, Mo.....	15	1
Little Rock, Ark.....	15	1
Des Moines, Iowa.....	15	1
Sioux City, Iowa.....	15	1

POSTAL SERVICE OFFICERS—Continued

Region and domicile	Positions	
	Level	Number
ST. LOUIS—Continued		
Columbia, Mo.	14	1
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	14	1
Mason City, Iowa	14	1
Kirkville, Mo.	14	1
West Memphis, Ark.	14	1
Fayetteville, Ark.	14	1
Jefferson City, Mo.	14	1
Rolla, Mo.	14	1
Council Bluffs, Iowa	14	1
St. Joseph, Mo.	14	1
Burlington, Iowa	12	1
Fort Smith, Ark.	12	1
Hot Springs National Park, Ark.	12	1
Poplar Bluff	12	1
St. Louis, Mo.	12	1
San Francisco		23
Oakland, Calif.	15	1
San Jose, Calif.	15	1
Redding, Calif.	15	1
Sacramento, Calif.	15	1
Van Nuys, Calif.	15	1
Inglewood, Calif.	15	1
Long Beach, Calif.	15	1
San Diego, Calif.	15	1
Honolulu, Hawaii	15	1
Alhambra, Calif.	15	1
Santa Ana, Calif.	15	1
Santa Rosa, Calif.	14	1
Pasadena, Calif.	14	1
San Bernardino, Calif.	14	1
Reno, Nev.	14	1
Oakland, Calif.	14	1
Ventura, Calif.	14	1
Stockton, Calif.	14	1
Fresno, Calif.	12	1
Las Vegas, Nev.	12	1
San Francisco, Calif.	12	3
Seattle		23
Spokane, Wash.	15	1
Tacoma, Wash.	15	1
Eugene, Oreg.	15	1
Boise, Idaho	15	1
Billings, Mont.	15	1
Portland, Oreg.	15	1
Butte, Mont.	15	1
Pendleton, Oreg.	15	1
Olympia, Wash.	15	1
Everett, Wash.	15	1
Salem, Oreg.	15	1
Great Falls, Mont.	14	1
Medford, Oreg.	14	1
Wolf Point, Mont.	14	1
Wenatchee, Wash.	14	1
Seattle, Wash.	14	1
Pasco, Wash.	12	2
Pocatello, Idaho	12	1
Twin Falls, Idaho	12	1
Portland, Oreg.	12	1
Seattle, Wash.	12	1
Do.	10	1
Washington, D.C.		18
Washington, D.C.	15	1
Baltimore, Md.	15	1
Martinsburg, W. Va.	15	1
Norfolk, Va.	15	1
Roanoke, Va.	15	1
Clarksburg, W. Va.	15	1
Beckley, W. Va.	15	1
Charlottesville, Va.	15	1
Lynchburg, Va.	15	1
Charleston, W. Va.	14	1
Wheeling, W. Va.	14	1
Salisbury, Md.	14	1
Fredericksburg, Va.	14	1
Cumberland, Md.	14	1
Bristol, Va.	14	1
Huntington, W. Va.	14	1
Baltimore, Md.	12	1
Bristol, Va.	12	1
Wichita		13
Lincoln, Nebr.	15	1
Salina, Kans.	15	1
Wichita, Kans.	15	1
Tulsa, Okla.	15	1
Lawton, Okla.	15	1
McAlester, Okla.	15	1
Grand Island, Nebr.	14	1
Topeka, Kans.	14	1
Dodge City, Kans.	14	1
Enid, Okla.	14	1
North Platte, Nebr.	12	1
Shawnee, Okla.	12	1
Wichita, Kans.	12	1
Total:		
Level 15		125
Level 14		111
Level 12		62
Level 10		10
Positions		308

[Standard Position Descriptions, Occupational Code 2305, Chapter C]

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE STANDARD POSITION 9-89

Salary Level: PFS-15

Title: Postal Service Officer

Key Position Reference No. 37

BASIC FUNCTION

As the traveling representative of the regional director is responsible in an assigned area for taking action to expedite the mail in transit within, emanating from or entering that postal area. Is responsible for the proper operational guidance of all postal installations and star and mail messenger routes within his territory in order that the most efficient and economical service may be rendered. This position is located in an average postal area which is characterized by a small number of large post offices in the area, average volume of originating mail, mail movement coordination problems of average difficulty with other regions, and mail movement in limited number of major business or industrial areas.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(A) Takes action to expedite the distribution and movement of mail by:

(1) Making certain that mail is handled properly, expeditiously, and economically at all points at all times.

(2) Reviewing service activities of all postal installations and contract operators, including star route and mail messengers to be certain that maximum efficiency in operation is maintained.

(3) Planning, developing and recommending revised methods for movement and distribution of mail within his assigned territory.

(B) Reviews requests for and makes recommendations concerning personnel complements, installations' organization and supervisory appointments when required by the regional director.

(C) Reviews requests for and makes recommendations concerning the establishment of city delivery service, contract branches and stations, rural stations and rural routes, star routes and mail messenger routes by the regional director when required.

(D) Reviews allowances for larger installations and recommends action to regional director when required by him.

(E) Appraises the performance of installation heads; evaluates the effectiveness of management at installations and recommends corrective action.

(F) Acts as advisor to postal installation heads on all postal activities performed in their installations; consults with postmasters concerning irregularities reported by postal inspectors, internal auditors, and Civil Service Commission inspectors and assists postmasters in taking necessary corrective action.

(G) As directed, represents the regional director before organizations, civic meetings, etc., and at dedications; handles other public relations matters.

(H) Keeps the regional director currently informed, through the principal postal service officer, concerning problems and developments in his area.

(I) As required, performs special assignments, and may be assigned to act in absence of higher level postal service officer.

(J) Assures that appropriate liaison between post office management officials and employee organization representatives is accomplished with respect to (1) employee complaint cases to which postal service officer has been assigned and (2) operating and organizational change matters in which postal service officer has participated.

ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Is responsible to the deputy regional director or director, postal service officer programs, to whom he makes recommendations regarding the movement and distribution of mail and operation of the postal installations in assigned area. Obtains technical advice and

guidance from key members of the regional director's staff on problems relating to their areas of specialization. Incumbent is subject to reassignment according to the needs of the postal service.

[Standard Position Descriptions, Occupational Code 2305, Chapter C]

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE STANDARD POSITION 9-90

Salary Level: PFS-14

Title: Postal Service Officer

Key Position Reference No. 35

BASIC FUNCTION

As the traveling representative of the regional director is responsible in a less complex area for the expeditious movement of mail in transit within, emanating from, or entering that postal area, or in a more complex area serves as an assistant to the postal service officer in charge of that area. A less complex area is one having one or two million-dollar offices and any number of smaller offices, less than average volume of originating mail, and only routine mail movement problems within the area. Incumbent is responsible for the proper operational guidance of all postal installations and star and mail messenger routes within his territory in order that the most efficient and economical service may be rendered.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(A) Represents the regional director in advising postmasters as to operations of stationary installations and mobile units including collection service, distribution procedures, pouching and dispatching mail, delivery services, work methods, case diagrams, furniture and equipment layouts and space needs.

(B) Reviews operations, and distribution of mobile units when required; analyzes services and operations of contract operators, including star route and mail messengers; reviews transportation patterns within, emanating from, and entering area of his responsibility, and makes recommendations concerning all of these matters to assure expeditious movement of mails.

(C) When required by the regional director, consults with and advises postmasters concerning manpower estimates, controls, usage, and complement changes.

(D) Coordinates special survey groups as directed.

(E) When required by the regional director, consults with postmasters regarding the establishment of city delivery service, contract branches and stations, rural stations and rural routes, star routes and mail messenger routes, and extension of city delivery service, rural routes and star routes and recommends action to be taken.

(F) As directed, represents the regional director before organizations and civic meetings and at dedications; handles other public relations matters.

(G) Consults with postmasters concerning irregularities reported by postal inspectors, internal auditors, and Civil Service Commission inspectors and assists postmasters in taking necessary corrective action.

(H) Appraises installation administration and supervision and makes corrective recommendations.

(I) Keeps the regional director currently informed, through the principal postal service officer concerning problems and developments in the field.

(J) Assures that appropriate liaison between post office management officials and employee organization representatives is accomplished with respect to (1) employee complaint cases to which postal service officer has been assigned and (2) operating and organizational change matters in which postal service officer has participated.

(K) Assists in training postal service officer trainees; performs other duties as directed by the principal postal service officer,

including participation in the orientation of new postmasters.

(L) From time to time, may be assigned responsibility for a more complex postal area.

ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Is responsible to the deputy regional director or to the director, postal service officer programs or other postal service officer, to whom he makes recommendations regarding the distribution and movement of mail and for the operation of the postal installations in his assigned area. Obtains technical advice and guidance from key members of the regional director's staff on problems relating to their areas of specialization. Incumbent is subject to reassignment according to the needs of the postal service.

[Chapter C, Standard Position Descriptions, Occupational Code 2305]

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE STANDARD POSITION 9-258

Salary Level: PFS-12

Title: Postal Service Officer

Key Position Reference No. 31

BASIC FUNCTION

Participates under guidance of postal service officer counselor and other postal service officers in all phases of postal service officer work, particularly in surveys and administrative matters involving the operation of postal installations and mail movement requirements.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(A) Attends instruction courses on the work of the postal service officer program and receives on-the-job training preparatory to assignment in territory of less complex area.

(B) During on-the-job training, under supervision of a postal service officer, undertakes assignments which are consistent with his training experience and development performing in part or in whole such duties as:

(1) Reviewing operations of postal installations including delivery and collection serv-

ice, distribution procedures, pouching and dispatching mail, work methods, case diagrams, furniture and equipment layouts and space needs.

(ii) Consults and advises with postmasters concerning manpower estimating; control, usage and complement requirements.

(iii) Participates in operational survey groups.

(iv) Consults with postmasters regarding establishment of city delivery service, contract stations and branches, rural stations and rural routes, star and mail messenger routes, extensions of city delivery service, rural and star route service and recommends action to be taken.

(v) Consults with postmasters and renders assistance in correcting irregularities reported by postal inspectors, internal auditors and Civil Service inspectors.

(vi) Assists in appraising installation administration and supervision and submits corrective recommendations.

(vii) Keeps the postal service officer when he is assisting currently informed of the problems and developments in the field.

(viii) Performs such other duties as directed including participation in the orientation of new postmasters.

ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Reports to deputy regional director or director, postal service officer programs through the postal service officer whom he is assisting and who is responsible for his training, supervision, assignments and work review.

[Standard Position Descriptions, Occupational Code 2305, Chapter C]

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE, STANDARD POSITION 9-257

Salary Level: PFS-10

Title: Postal Service Officer

Key Position Reference No. 27

BASIC FUNCTION

In a training assignment under close supervision by postal service officer counselor 1967-6TH ACCOUNTING PERIOD—NOV. 5 TO DEC. 2

sor; receives orientation and basic instructions and participates in the work involving proper guidance of postal installations.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(A) Attends training schools for both basic and advanced training in the work of the postal service officers and receives on-the-job training in the field.

(B) During on-the-job training, under the guidance and supervision of postal service officer counselor, undertakes assignments which are consistent with his training and development, performing in part or in whole such duties as:

(1) Reviewing operations of postal installations including delivery and collection service, distribution procedures, pouching and dispatching mail, work methods, case diagrams, furniture and equipment layouts and space needs.

(ii) Consults and advises with postmasters concerning manpower estimating; control, usage and complement requirements.

(iii) Participates in operational survey groups.

(iv) Consults with postmasters regarding establishment of city delivery service, contract stations and branches, rural stations and rural routes, star and mail messenger routes, extensions of city delivery service, rural and star route service and recommends action to be taken.

(v) Consults with postmasters and renders assistance in correcting irregularities reported by postal inspectors, internal auditors and Civil Service inspectors.

(vi) Performs a variety of other matters determined by the degree of his experience and as assigned.

ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Reports to deputy regional director or director, postal service officer programs, through the postal service officer counselor responsible for his training supervision and work review.

Date	Post office	Class	Installation	Purpose of visit	Hours
Sunday, Nov. 5					
Monday, Nov. 6	Kansas City, Mo.	1		Office reports correspondence.	9
Tuesday, Nov. 7	Excelsior Springs, Mo.	1		Followup on inspection report, outgoing distribution, delivery.	3
Do.	Liberty, Mo.	1		Scheduling, outgoing distribution (1st-class), transportation (star route) delivery.	3
Do.	Lawson, Mo.	2		Scheduling and Christmas plans.	2
Wednesday, Nov. 8	Higginsville, Mo.	1		Followup inspection report, collection service, Christmas plans.	6
Do.	Rayville, Mo.	3		Rural route, reporting and leaving time.	2
Thursday, Nov. 9	Lee's Summit, Mo.	1		Subclerks appointments, man-hour and scheduling, outgoing distribution and dispatch, star route.	7
Friday, Nov. 10	Kansas City, Mo.	1		Office, reports and correspondence.	8
Saturday, Nov. 11	do	1	SCF	Makeup and dispatch of mail.	4
Sunday, Nov. 12					
Monday, Nov. 13	Higginsville, Mo.	1		1610 case No. 725, complaint file, transportation problems.	5½
Tuesday, Nov. 14	St. Joseph, Mo.	1		Scheduling of supervisors, makeup and dispatch of mail.	7
Wednesday, Nov. 15	Tarkio, Mo.	2		Followup on inspection report.	2
Do.	Rockport, Mo.	2		1610 case No. 641, rural route, star route, special report request.	6
Thursday, Nov. 16	St. Joseph, Mo.	1		Incoming distribution, 1st- and 2d-class, airmail.	8½
Friday, Nov. 17	Kansas City, Mo.	1	P.O.-SCF	Makeup and dispatch of mail, delayed mail.	8
Saturday, Nov. 18	do	1		Office work.	4
Sunday, Nov. 19	do	1		Scheduling, makeup and dispatch.	2
Monday, Nov. 20	Independence, Mo.	1		1610 on safety, man-hour and volume reports, incoming distribution.	6½
Tuesday, Nov. 21	Kansas City, Mo.	1	Truck ter	Transportation, star routes.	2
Do.	do	1	SCF	Makeup and dispatch of mail, scheduling, star route.	5
Do.	Higginsville, Mo.	1		Incoming distribution and dispatch.	2
Do.	Cordee, Mo.	3		Followup on inspection report.	2
Wednesday, Nov. 22	Concordia, Mo.	2		do.	2
Do.	Blue Springs, Mo.	1		Followup on inspection report, scheduling, distribution and dispatch.	6
Do.	Alma, Mo.	3		Scheduling, transportation star route.	2
Thursday, Nov. 23					18
Friday, Nov. 24					28
Saturday, Nov. 25					
Sunday, Nov. 26					
Monday, Nov. 27	Kansas City, Mo.	1	SCF	Distribution and dispatch, case diagrams, office work.	8
Tuesday, Nov. 28	Richmond, Mo.	1		1610 complaint file, Christmas plans on scheduling.	2
Do.	Warrensburg, Mo.	1		Manhour volume reports, scheduling, carrier service.	5
Wednesday, Nov. 29	Kansas City, Mo.	1	Central station	Social security checks.	10
Thursday, Nov. 30	do	1	Truck terminal	Makeup and dispatch of parcel post.	2
Do.	Independence, Mo.	1		Scheduling, delivery 3997-B.	4
Do.	Liberty, Mo.	1		Department project, scheduling, Christmas plans.	3
Friday, Dec. 1	Kansas City, Mo.	1	AMF	Scheduling, vehicle service, safety.	6
Do.	do	1	SCF	Transportation.	2
Saturday, Dec. 2	do	1		Office Work.	5
Total hours					177½

¹ Thanksgiving holiday.
² Annual leave.

1 Holiday and 1 annual leave. 6 days off: 1 annual leave, 1 Holiday, 1 Saturday, 3 Sundays. Travel time between post offices not included.

Note: 28 days accounting period: 19 duty days (4 Saturdays, 4 Sundays, 1 Holiday). 22 days on duty: Average 9.8 hours per regular duty day (based on 18 to 28 minus 8 Saturdays and Sundays).

REAL ESTATE OFFICERS

There are 92 real estate officers; 18 in PFS-14 and 74 in PFS-15.

The average workweek is over 50 hours per week. Two officers of the Philadelphia Region averaged 69 hours per week during a recent accounting period.

The basic function of this position is for the employee to conduct surveys concerning the real estate; appraise land and property values; negotiate with bidders for acquisition of property through leases, rental agreements, assignable land options, or purchase agreements. Much of the employee's activity is confined to night duty. He must meet with owners, city developers, planning commissions, boards of zoning appeals, and similar groups which normally meet only in the evening.

Like the postal service officers, these employees currently are not paid any overtime or night differential. However, upon extension of the overtime premium provisions to postal inspectors, the Department feels that they would have to authorize either an overtime pay at time and one-half, or cut the employees back to a 40-hour workweek. Such action is estimated to require the employment of approximately 30 additional real estate officers.

Statistical information follows:

REAL ESTATE OFFICERS

Region and domicile	Positions	
	Level	Number
Atlanta		4
Atlanta, Ga.	15	2
Greensboro, N.C.	15	1
Columbia, S.C.	14	1
Boston		6
Bridgeport, Conn.	15	1
Boston, Mass.	15	1
Providence, R.I.	15	1
Montpelier, Vt.	15	1
Portland, Maine	15	1
Brookton, Mass.	15	1
Chicago		7
Grand Rapids, Mich.	15	1
Detroit, Mich.	15	1
Chicago, Ill.	15	2
Peoria, Ill.	15	2
Centralia, Ill.	14	1
Cincinnati		8
Cincinnati, Ohio	15	5
Do.	14	3
Dallas		6
Houston, Tex.	15	2
Lubbock, Tex.	15	1
Shreveport, La.	15	1
New Orleans, La.	15	1
Dallas, Tex.	14	1
Denver		2
Phoenix, Ariz.	15	1
Salt Lake City, Utah	15	1
Memphis		3
Montgomery, Ala.	15	1
Memphis, Tenn.	15	1
Chattanooga, Tenn.	15	1
Minneapolis		5
Minneapolis, Minn.	15	1
Milwaukee, Wis.	15	3
Aberdeen, S. Dak.	14	1
New York		11
New York, N.Y.	15	4
Albany, N.Y.	15	1
Minneapolis, N.Y.	15	1
New York, N.Y.	14	2
Syracuse, N.Y.	14	2
San Juan, P.R.	14	1

REAL ESTATE OFFICERS—Continued

Region and domicile	Positions	
	Level	Number
Philadelphia		9
Philadelphia, Pa.	15	4
Newark, N.J.	15	3
Pittsburgh, Pa.	15	2
St. Louis		6
St. Louis, Mo.	15	3
Kansas City, Mo.	15	1
Des Moines, Iowa	15	1
Little Rock, Ark.	14	1
San Francisco		9
Los Angeles, Calif.	15	3
San Francisco, Calif.	15	3
San Diego, Calif.	15	1
Sacramento, Calif.	14	1
Los Angeles, Calif.	14	1
Seattle		5
Seattle, Wash.	15	2
Spokane, Wash.	15	1
Portland, Oreg.	15	1
Billings, Mont.	15	1
Washington, D.C.		6
Washington, D.C.	15	2
Roanoke, Va.	15	1
Richmond, Va.	15	1
Logan, W. Va.	14	1
Clarksburg, W. Va.	14	1
Wichita		5
Wichita, Kans.	15	2
Tulsa, Okla.	15	1
Lincoln, Nebr.	15	1
Wichita, Kans.	14	1
Total:		
Level 14		18
Level 15		74
Positions		92

[Standard Position Descriptions, Occupational Code 1170, Chapter C]

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE STANDARD POSITION 9-86

Salary Level: PFS-14

Title: Real Estate Officer

Key Position Reference No. 36

BASIC FUNCTION

Conducts surveys concerning real estate such as sites, leases, and space matters; appraises land and property values; negotiates with bidders for acquisition of property through leases, rental agreements, assignable land options or purchase agreements.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(A) Conducts surveys in lease or rental cases to determine: prospects of obtaining adequate quarters in existing buildings; availability of sites and their values for construction of appropriate facilities; and competitive conditions available in the locality. Negotiates with city and local civic organizations to obtain cooperation in selecting suitable sites and stimulating competition for postal facility development.

(B) Develops market data and fundamental real estate information; appraises land and develops property values; negotiates with property owners to determine availability of assignable land options; recommends preferred site from service and real estate standpoint, including factors of price and location.

(C) Analyzes and evaluates all real estate factors developed in surveys. Determines from a construction standpoint whether the existing facilities are adequate as is or with remodeling; whether the facility should be located in another building and if remodeling is required; or whether the Department should be housed in a new facility, and makes appropriate alternative recommendations to chief, real estate branch or user. Negotiates extension agreements for current quarters; negotiates for and obtains land options for appropriate sites. Prepares complete real estate information regarding each project

and presents to appropriate (space using) unit official for review. Takes necessary action to make real estate transaction acceptable from a service standpoint. Obtains concurrence and uses as basis of final action within delegated authority or forwards with recommendation to chief, real estate branch.

(D) Prepares Bidders Package for use in solicitation for agreements to lease quarters on all projects within his delegated authority or as directed. Such a package may include one or more of the following advertisements, land options, forms for the agreements to lease addendums to the lease containing specific building requirements determined by the real estate agent, site plans, elevations and floor layouts. Develops bidders and stimulates competition, furnishes all prospective bidders with Bidders Package for study and submission of proposals.

(E) Conducts negotiations with bidders in the acquisition of postal space through lease rental agreement or assignable land option to obtain the best price for the Government; considers in these negotiations adequacy of location from a postal service standpoint, prevailing land values and rental rates for comparable property; conformance to city ordinances and deed restrictions; marketability of optioned land; financial responsibility of bidder when construction is involved and bidder's ability to obtain financing at fair and reasonable rates. Reviews and analyzes all bids. Takes final action within delegated authority and forwards others to chief, real estate branch with recommendations.

(F) Supervises preparation of site plans and elevations and recommends design of new buildings; advises architects and engineers on postal requirements; inspects buildings during construction for compliance with contract. Makes final inspection of leased quarters for readiness for occupancy and compliance with covenants of lease agreement; makes decision as to the date the installation head shall accept occupancy. In so doing, there rests on his shoulders the responsibility for any mistakes which could bind the Government for liability to make payments for buildings which do not meet the requirements of the lease agreement. Recommends final acceptance.

(G) Conducts surveys on nonpostal space in Government-owned buildings; recommends assignment or reassignment of space; studies need for extensions, remodeling or structural changes and in collaboration with regional engineer makes appropriate recommendations. At direction of regional real estate manager, collaborates with General Services Administration representatives in determining needed changes to Government-owned buildings.

(H) Confers with postal officials, property owners; contractors; the investing public; bankers and mortgage companies; executives of industry, airline and railroad companies; municipal bodies such as city councils, zoning boards, etc.; and with public officials at all levels, including Congressmen and Senators in negotiating for acquisition of postal space and the resolution of difficulties encountered. Confers with officials of other Government agencies in connection with the building management program.

(I) Conducts special difficult investigations as assigned.

ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Reports to chief, real estate branch.

[Standard Position Descriptions, Occupational Code 1170, Chapter C]

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE STANDARD POSITION 9-85

Salary Level: PFS-15

Title: Real Estate Officer

Key Position Reference No. 38

BASIC FUNCTION

Conducts involved and difficult surveys concerning real estate such as sites, leases and space matters, appraises land and prop-

erty values; negotiates with bidders for acquisition of property through leases, rental agreements, assignable land options or purchase agreements.

NOTE.—This description is limited to those positions where the major portion of the incumbent's time is devoted to lease and land procurement cases, which require a high level of professional real estate competency and which involve complex negotiations and work preliminary to negotiation caused by problems such as high land values, limited availability of property, great public interest, etc.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(A) Conducts surveys in involved and difficult lease or rental cases to determine: prospects of obtaining adequate quarters in existing buildings; availability of sites and their values for construction of appropriate facilities; and competitive conditions available in the locality. Negotiates with city and local civic organizations to obtain cooperation in selecting suitable sites and stimulating competition for postal facility development.

(B) Develops market data and fundamental real estate information; appraises land and develops property values; negotiates with property owners to determine availability of assignable land options; recommends preferred site from service and real estate standpoint including factors of price and location.

(C) Analyzes and evaluates all real estate factors developed in surveys. Determines from a construction standpoint whether the existing facilities are adequate as is or with remodeling; whether the facility should be located in another building and if remodeling is required; or whether the Department should be housed in a new facility, and makes appropriate alternative recommendations to chief, real estate branch or user. Negotiates extension agreements for current quarters; negotiates for and obtains land options for appropriate sites. Prepares complete real estate information regarding each project and presents to appropriate (space using) unit official for review. Takes necessary action to make real estate transaction acceptable from a service standpoint. Obtains concurrence and uses as basis of final action within delegated authority or forwards with recommendation to regional chief, real estate branch.

(D) Prepares "Bidders Package" for use in solicitation for agreements to lease quarters on all projects within his delegated authority or as directed. Such a package may include one or more of the following: advertisements, land options, forms for the agreements to lease addendums to the lease containing specific building requirements determined by the Real Estate Agent, site plans, elevations and floor layouts. Develops bidders and stimulates competition, furnishes all prospective bidders with Bidders Package for study and submission of proposals.

(E) Conducts negotiations with bidders in the acquisition of postal space through lease rental agreement or assignable land option to obtain the best price for the Government; considers in these negotiations adequacy of location from a postal service standpoint, prevailing land values and rental rates for comparable property; conformance to city ordinances and deed restrictions; marketability of optioned land; financial responsibility of bidder when construction is involved and bidder's ability to obtain financing at fair and reasonable rates. Reviews and analyzes all bids. Takes final action within delegated authority and forwards others to chief, real estate branch with recommendations.

(F) Supervises preparation of site plans and elevations and recommends design of new buildings; advises architects and engineers on postal requirements; inspects build-

ings during construction for compliance with contract. Makes final inspection of leased quarters for readiness for occupancy and compliance with covenants of lease agreement; makes decision as to date the installation head shall accept occupancy. In so doing, the real estate agent is responsible for any mistakes which could bind the Government for liability to make payments for buildings which do not meet the requirements of the lease agreement. Recommends final acceptance.

(G) Conducts surveys on nonpostal space in Government-owned buildings; recommends assignment or reassignment of space; studies need for extensions, remodeling or structural changes and in collaboration with Regional Engineer makes appropriate recommendations. At direction of chief, real estate branch, collaborates with General Services Administration representatives in determining needed changes to Government-owned buildings.

(H) Confers with postal officials, property owners; contractors; the investing public; bankers and mortgage companies; executives of industry; airline and railroad companies; municipal bodies such as city councils, zoning boards, etc.; and with public officials at all levels, including Congressmen and Senators in negotiating for acquisition of postal space and resolution of difficulties encountered. Confers with officials of other Government agencies in connection with the building management program.

(I) Conducts special difficult investigations as assigned.

ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Reports to chief, real estate branch.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman of the full committee.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation (H.R. 14933) which will permit the Postmaster General to provide premium pay to employees of the postal field service for irregular and unscheduled overtime.

This legislation is recommended by the Postmaster General, and was favorably reported by our committee without any opposing votes.

The basic purpose of this legislation is to extend to postal field service employees, benefits which have been enjoyed by the majority of our Government employees since 1954. This legislation will permit the Postmaster General to provide premium pay for certain postal employees when he determines that the position of the employee requires him to perform irregular and unscheduled overtime that cannot be controlled administratively.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. NIX], the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], and other members of the subcommittee are to be congratulated for their time and effort in processing this legislation so that it could be considered here today by the House of Representatives.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to oppose this legislation for a number of reasons I consider to be valid, not the

least of which is that it represents an extravagance and spending of the taxpayer's money that we can ill afford during this period of budget cutting and belt tightening.

H.R. 14933 should be sent back to the committee, and it should not be brought up again until or unless the Nation can afford the magnificence it bestows on only a few top-level employees in the postal service.

The \$4.3 million price tag of this bill represents an unjustifiable average yearly salary increase of \$3,030 for 1,430 prestige positions in the postal service. The positions intended to be covered by this bill, postal service officers, real estate officers, and inspectors, are already high-level jobs, levels 10 through 15, which now pay up to \$17,295 per year, and which will automatically be increased up to a maximum of \$18,161 next July first—and that is not far away.

I submit that these jobs now pay the high salaries they do principally in recognition of the erratic work schedules involved. In fact, a prerequisite to being appointed to one of these jobs is a personal interview in the presence of families so that the prospective employee will fully understand the demands and requirements of the job. These 1,430 prestige positions are now doing very well as far as pay is concerned. They each received a 6 percent salary increase in December retroactive to October 1, and they will receive another 5 percent increase this coming July.

There is simply no justification for giving almost all these top level people a yearly bonanza of over \$3,000 each at a time when they have received two substantial pay raises in 7 months and when the total Federal payroll is automatically being increased by another billion dollars.

Mr. Chairman, it must be kept in mind that in passing out this largess to a few employees we are doing absolutely nothing in this bill for the thousands of clerks, carriers, and other rank and file employees upon whom we depend to actually move the mail. In addition, this bill does nothing for any of the postmasters in our districts who are required to work many hours overtime every week and it does nothing for any of the working supervisory personnel in any post office.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the regular clerks and carriers in the postal service today are, in most cases, being denied overtime work so that they are unable to augment their take-home salaries. I am certain that they would be happy to work all the overtime that could be made available to them. Most certainly they would be tickled to be included in the yearly bonanza that is built into this bill.

I do not think any of us should be taken in by the argument that these top level people cannot control the hours they work. They are under no rigid daily supervision and I am unable to believe that when a postal service officer knows he is to spend 4 hours at a testimonial banquet at night or at a post office dedication on a Saturday that he is not able to arrange his workweek accordingly. Frankly, if he is not smart enough to do so he should not have the job in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, up until 3 years ago supervisors in the postal service in levels 8 and above could not be paid for any overtime that might be worked. Any such supervisor who performed overtime or holiday work was granted compensatory time—time off—in an amount equal to the overtime or holiday work. The Pay Act of 1965, for the first time, permitted supervisors to be paid overtime in lieu of compensatory time in the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Even so, from all the evidence we have, the Postmaster General is strict with "this discretionary authority" as it relates to payment for overtime worked by supervisors in the middle and upper grades. It is still a policy that wherever possible these employees are required to take compensatory time.

This bill, as I indicated earlier, will not help the supervisors or, in fact, any of the rank and file postal employees. Its benefits are limited to relatively few prestige positions in the service that are already well paid and for which there are long waiting lists. As an example of how coveted these jobs are, for 26 service officer appointments in calendar year 1967, 4,862 employees competed on the examination—187 applicants for every single position available. It seems to me that this testifies eloquently to the fact that these are coveted jobs and they are not suffering from lack of remuneration.

I also wish to point out that there is a very serious built-in inequity in this bill that is bound to cause untold problems and that will certainly do little to help the morale of the employees involved. The bill specifically exempts employees in salary levels 16 and above from the premium pay bonanza. There are now 104 postal inspectors in levels 16 through 20. If this bill is enacted most of these inspectors will be making less money than many inspectors in levels 14 and 15.

For example, an inspector now in the top step of level 15 will receive \$18,161 under the July 1 pay schedule. When you add his premium bonanza of \$3,030, his total take-home pay will be \$21,191. This is more money than will be earned by any employee in level 16, all employees in steps 1 through 8 of level 17, all employees in steps 1 through 4 in level 18, and all employees in the first step of level 19. This completely distorts and destroys any concept that "pay distinctions shall be maintained in keeping with work and performance distinctions" as required by the Salary Reform Act of 1962.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, this is not a good bill and it most certainly is not a bill that we should be considering at this time. Our present total Federal payroll is now at a staggering all-time high of \$25 billion per year. It will be further automatically increased another billion dollars this coming July 1. I see no justification for adding another \$4.3 million this year just in an attempt to pay more money to a few prestige positions that are already well paid.

Mr. Chairman, I would call your attention to the fact that only last week we crossed the \$352 billion mark in the Federal debt. And I am sure I do not have to tell you, for you are hearing the re-

ports being circulated in the House, just as I am, that the debt ceiling is going to have to be raised again this year.

I sincerely and earnestly urge that this bill will be rejected at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana, a member of the full committee and a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 14933. The bill corrects an inequity in the law in that it provides for a differential in lieu of overtime pay for certain postal employees who work long, irregular, and unsupervised overtime hours. Postal employees are exempt from a similar pay differential now authorized for most other Government employees. H.R. 14933 is supported by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Overtime pay is authorized for most postal employees, but not for postal inspectors and certain other employees who have no supervisor to authorize premium pay and are responsible for determining their own hours of work.

A postal inspector must protect the U.S. mails against the results of natural disasters such as hurricanes and the like as well as accidents such as airline and train wrecks. The thief who steals social security checks from mail boxes is apprehended by postal inspectors. All of these duties are in the nature of emergencies. Work must be done without any present administrative plan. There is no room for the clock watcher in this kind of work, while there is the need for round-the-clock work.

Only the postal inspector on a case can determine the need for continued surveillance of a criminal. An FBI man who has the occasion to work on the same case with a postal inspector receives premium pay differential for his extra hours while the postal inspector does not. This situation will be remedied by the passage of this bill.

The language of the bill is general and authorizes the Postmaster General to determine the particular employee who will be entitled to the benefits. It is expected that real estate officers and postal service officers who have to disregard the clock and work over 50 hours per week will be included by the Postmaster General for the same reasons as a postal inspector.

Real estate officers must negotiate property rights when city councils, zoning boards, and others are able to meet with him; which is usually at night. Certainly, the Federal Government benefits by many thousands of dollars when contracts and leases favorable to the Federal Government are agreed to.

Postal service officers are the trouble-shooters of the Post Office Department. They work out of regional offices and do extensive traveling. Their work basically involves cleaning up distribution and transportation bottlenecks. In a postal system that delivers more mail than all of the other postal systems of the world combined, there are countless problems. These men must be on the job constantly when a problem develops in

a post office, because the mail continues to come in and there is no place to store it. It must be gotten out.

All of these employees have to travel on Sundays and holidays. If they worked for any other department of the Government, they would receive premium pay for their extra hours.

The Postmaster General is given the discretion to apply the benefits of this bill in situations that require it, in the same way that the Civil Service Commission is applying the same kind of rules today for other Government employees.

I believe that fairness requires the passage of this bill. A postal inspector guarding and collecting mail scattered over the scene of an air crash deserves extra pay for his extra work. I hope the House will support the bill.

METHOD OF APPOINTMENTS POSTAL SERVICE OFFICERS

Beginning in 1962, postal service officers have been recommended for appointment by the regional director subject to approval by the headquarters office.

The advisory service is not used in connection with these appointments. One of the qualifications for a postal service officer is that the individual have a minimum of 5 years in the postal service.

The first step in making the appointments was an examination open to all postal field service employees who had the minimum qualifications which, as I have indicated, included 5 years in the postal service.

Those employees who successfully completed the written examination were given a personal interview in the presence of their families, so that all would understand the demands that were anticipated of the postal field service officer.

Selection was made by the regional director from among those in his region, based on the written examination, the personal interview, and the background and personality of the individual.

No register was established, and the action taken really was in the nature of a promotion based solely on merit. The regional director's selection was subject to approval by the headquarters staff.

This system was initiated in 1962, when the examination was given to 539 applicants, 257 of whom passed the examination. The most recent examination was given in March 1967 to 4,862 employees, 1,013 of whom passed the examination. Appointments actually made from the various examinations are as follows:

Calendar year:	Appointments
1962-----	24
1963-----	24
1964-----	23
1965-----	52
1966-----	121
1967-----	26

REAL ESTATE OFFICERS

The qualification standards are prescribed by the Post Office Department and approved by the Civil Service Commission. The major qualification is that the individual have a background and experience in real estate matters.

An unassembled examination is given that is an examination strictly on the basis of background and experience.

Appointments are made by the regional director solely on the basis of background qualifications and experience.

Let us understand. A postal inspector must protect the U.S. mails against the result of national or natural disasters, or whatever disasters, such as hurricanes and the like, as well as accidents, such as airline and train wrecks. The thief who steals social security checks from mailboxes is apprehended by postal inspectors.

All of these duties are in the nature of emergencies. Work must be done without any administrative preplan. There is no room for the clockwatcher in this kind of work, while there is the need for around-the-clock work. Only the postal inspector on a case can determine the need for continued surveillance of a criminal or of a suspected criminal.

An FBI agent, who has to work on the same case with a postal inspector, receives premium pay differential for his extra hours, while the postal inspector, working side by side with the FBI agent, does not get the premium pay. He does not get the time and a half overtime pay. This situation will be remedied by the passage of this bill, which is so very welcome to me, as it is to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix].

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out for the record and to the Members of Congress that most of the postal inspectors are picked on an equal basis, about half Democrat and half Republican. Is that not correct?

Mr. OLSEN. That is correct. I do not think there is any real distinction among the politics, but I think it works out about that way.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Will the gentleman advise the Members if we are having any trouble recruiting any of these three categories—the field inspection service employees, the regional real estate officers, or the regional field service officers?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes, we are. We are having our problems recruiting them. What is worse, after we have recruited these people in these grades, we have a terrible problem of losing them to private industry and to the classified service.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman mean, if he will yield further, that the turnover is too rapid and there is not enough tenure in the inspection service and among the 92-odd real estate agents and the 308 field service officers? Is that correct?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes. This is our problem. We foresee that our recruitment of this standard of person will be hampered in the future if we do not take this step.

Mr. HALL. Can the gentleman tell the Members whether or not there is a waiting list for appointment to any of these positions in the postal service? The information I have is that there is a rather long list of applicants waiting appointment for all three of these services, which would indicate to me—as a former personnel officer—that maybe it is a pretty good job.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, there is a waiting list. It is because we have not upgraded our standards as we should. We find we should upgrade the standards in these fields, and we should upgrade the grade level at which they are employed, and do it in advance, so that we do not lose them after we get them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman advise us whether this \$4,369,000 is in the Presidential budget for this year or not?

Mr. OLSEN. I cannot advise the gentleman about that, but I will yield to the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, I am informed it is in the Presidential budget for this fiscal year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I will say that I was unable to find it in the budget, but the gentleman's statement is certainly of value as far as information is concerned.

I think there is some justice for this as far as the inspection service is concerned. My consideration and my worry is about the timing—the timing of bringing this to the floor of the Congress in view of the planned deficit in this year's budget.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his contribution.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a question relative to the exclusion of employees in those salary levels of PFS-16 and above, why was it cut off at that point?

Mr. OLSEN. I believe the answer is that those people who are PFS-16 and above are much like the Members of Congress; they determine their own hours.

Mr. CASEY. The gentleman just stated to me a justification for the overtime for those below the 16 level, based on the fact that they do have overtime work and work more or less on their own without supervision; is that correct?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes. If I may interrupt there, the bill would provide that the Postmaster General would determine that the individual person in that individual slot would get the overtime pay, at his own determination.

Mr. CASEY. We are still talking about level 16 and below?

Mr. OLSEN. Yes, we are. For 16 and above it is the judgment of the committee that the salary is high enough that they should have to expect odd-hour employment because on another day they could shorten their hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASEY. The criticism was heard earlier—and it is one which has been raised to me by some of my interested constituents—relative to those in level 16. They are frozen, while there could be those in level 15 or even level 14 who would by reason of this bill make more, under the limitation, which is up to PFS-18.

Mr. OLSEN. Yes. That complaint is well taken, but the committee thought it had to draw the line somewhere, and this is where we draw the line.

Mr. CASEY. If we are going to try to keep things on a fairly equitable basis, why was the limitation, instead of 16, not made at 18? Can the gentleman tell me that?

Mr. OLSEN. I would say that happened in the committee. That is all I can say. We did the best we could.

Mr. CASEY. What would be the gentleman's opinion as to removing this limitation on level 16 and, say, taking it up to level 17?

Mr. OLSEN. My own opinion would be we should not have any limitation, but I did not win in the committee. The committee decided we would have this limitation. Frankly, that is what happened.

Mr. CASEY. I hate to see this discrimination, so to speak, against level 16. I am sure those people are working just as hard as the people in level 15 or 14, yet they will be frozen at the 16 level.

Mr. OLSEN. Yes. It is a question that their base pay is higher. I agree with the gentleman, but we had to make a decision, and that is how it was made.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps we can offer an amendment.

Mr. OLSEN. I am not the chairman of this subcommittee. I am going to stay with the chairman, because I am kind of locked in, too.

Mr. CASEY. I understand. This is not being considered under a closed rule, and it would be subject to an amendment.

Mr. OLSEN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman comment on the effect on promotions this would have, as between levels 15 and 16?

Mr. OLSEN. I did not know that that would make any difference.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean the difference in pay would make no difference?

Mr. OLSEN. I did not know that there would be any effect upon promotions in this field.

Mr. GROSS. Why would anyone want a promotion if he could make more money at a lower grade than a higher grade?

Mr. OLSEN. I understand the gentleman's point. If he could contemplate and have some assurance that his overtime would be so great, perhaps he would stay at the lower grade. But I do not believe he could plan on that.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. I agree with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] said a while ago, I am going to offer an amendment to raise the salary level to PFS-17, and also to raise the regional offices to PFS-16. I believe that would be more reasonable and more equitable, if the House will accept the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14933. This bill passed the committee unanimously with the exception of one member who voted "present." This legislation comes to us as a request from the Post Office Department. I believe the request for this legislation is reasonable and proper.

I will not go into the details on this legislation, because they have been explained most adequately by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. NIX], of which subcommittee I am the ranking minority member.

I believe in economy, too, but these men that we are considering here have important tasks to perform, and we must pay them an adequate wage in order to keep them. We had an experience in Nebraska not too long ago involving the Post Office Department where they instituted the small plane air taxi service for the delivery of mail from one point to another point in Nebraska.

About 2 or 3 days after this service was inaugurated, the plane crashed and killed the two pilots, scattering the mail over a large area. A lot of it was partially burned and some of it was totally burned. This required the postal inspectors to get on the job immediately and work long hours with very little sleep over long periods of time in trying to retrieve this mail, and identify the partially burned mail, and put it on its way, and do all of the other things necessary to protect this mail from being lost.

These men are called upon to do this type of emergency work as well as many other types of emergency work throughout the year. Yet they get no additional salary for this extra duty. They do get a per diem and they do get travel expense, but so far as their salary is concerned, they could work 7 days a week for several weeks at a time with no additional compensation for their overtime. So there is a big burden placed on them here, and they get no extra pay for it. This legislation takes care of that inequity. It only brings these three categories of postal employees up to the status of persons in equal types of employment in the classified service.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say in conclusion that I support this bill because there is an inequity which exists here, and this bill will take care of that inequity. I do hope that there will be

no crippling amendments and that we can pass this bill and go on with other business that we have and take care of the other things we have to do in our offices this afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise and take this time because I am interested in the correct record, as I am sure are the gentlemen who are sponsoring this bill on the floor. A while ago in the colloquy and general debate which was advanced for the purpose of information only, the question was asked about whether this was included in the President's 1969 budget or not. I believe we received the statement, if I understood it correctly, that it was in the budget. Without being in the position of trying to do other than confirm that statement, I have talked to the Committee on Appropriations and especially the Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Committee on Appropriations and have been told that it is not in the President's fiscal year 1969 budget.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania could give us some reassurance as to where this money is coming from, as to whether it is contained in the budget or not, and can tell the members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union about the plans for meeting this proposed pay increase.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield to me at this point?

Mr. HALL. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I have every assurance from authoritative sources that this sum is contained in the budget of the Postmaster General as a part of the Presidential budget. I cannot put my finger on the particular amount as separated from the total figure as contained in the budget. However, I have information upon which I can rely that it is included in that budget.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania realizes the spirit in which I raise this question, at a time of a planned deficit, at a time when the President and the executive branch has used the Congress, indeed, as a whipping boy, at a time of increases across the board, when instead this should be a time of austerity, bearing in mind the fiscal posture of this Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure that I understand the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation, when he said that this amount is contained in the budget and that the gentleman has received assurance from his staff or from the Post Office Department and its representatives that this sum is contained in the budget although, perhaps, it may be contained in a contingency fund or a service fund but not as a line-item for this purpose.

Is my understanding of the situation correct?

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri will yield further, I can assure the gentleman that this amount is contained in the budget. Now, in what form it is contained, I cannot furnish to the gentleman from Missouri that information. However, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that I understand thoroughly his position and I appreciate and respect his continuing concern with reference to fiscal and financial matters. However, as to the specific question which the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has posed, I repeat that I am convinced it is a part of the President's budget.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me at that point?

Mr. HALL. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This \$4,300,000 expenditure is either in the budget or it is not. And, if we are being assured that the Post Office Department has the sum of \$4,300,000 in loose change with which to pay this increase, then it is my opinion we need to find out just what goes on in the Post Office Department. If they can come up with \$4,300,000 for a purpose of this kind at any time, without a change in the budget as submitted to the Congress of the United States, we need to know it. It is either in the budget or it is not.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that I completely agree with the gentleman, and say further that this at least represents excess fat on the crock of milk. I have been twice assured by the Committee on Appropriations and by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles this particular appropriation bill that this is the case. However, I have now made that point and I now yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman from Missouri that this represents the manner in which the bill came to us for our consideration. The Post Office Department brought it to us as represented by the chief inspector of the Post Office Department, Mr. Montague, who assured us that this would not change their budget in any manner whatsoever and that it was provided for. Of course we were attracted to it because we want to encourage the operations of the postal service.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman from Montana and the members of his committee practice the scrutiny of line items and place particular emphasis thereon with reference to authorizations, and would this in effect represent a reprogramming of the already authorized figures in the budget, wherein they will get this \$4.5 million a year?

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am sure it is not a line item; but I want to say that it is in the same context as is contained in the reason for and purposes in supporting appropriations as, for instance, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is the same proposition where they have

the approval of the Department and they have had it approved by the Bureau of the Budget. I am, however, advised that it is not a line item. However, I am advised that it is an item for which provision has been made.

Mr. HALL. I just want to say in answer to the gentleman that I appreciate his trying to help with this troublesome problem. I believe it is our elected duty that we should face up to the fact and point out to the appointed bureaucrats in the Cabinet, or in the bureaus, that when they wish to send a bill down to the Congress for enactment that they necessarily stay within the budget limits. I have lost the faith the gentleman apparently has, in such persons.

I have seen too many instances when it does not necessarily so follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my support today for H.R. 14933, a bill that would establish an eminently just and workable method of paying the many postal service field employees now working long hours of overtime without compensation.

This needed piece of legislation would give the Postmaster General authority to provide premium pay for postal field employees who put in significant amounts of unscheduled overtime at night, on Sundays, and on holidays. These employees, whose hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively, are charged with recognizing circumstances that require them to work overtime. They now receive no extra compensation whatsoever.

Postal operations, as we all know, run 24 hours a day and 7 days a week in every city and hamlet in the country. To process the mail and to assure that all administrative, legal, and public service requirements are fully met requires the services of a large number of trained specialists who can work when and where the circumstances of the moment demand. I refer to inspectors who are pursuing criminal actions or who are rushed to a scene of a plane disaster to secure the U.S. mail, or postal service officers who must participate in both early incoming and late afternoon peak mail movements, or regional real estate officers who must work unpredictable hours to obtain the most advantageous building site for the Government.

Postal inspectors, postal service officers, and regional real estate officers now have the responsibility of working longer than 8 hours a day when needed. They are unsupervised for the most part. Supervised employees can apply for overtime when needed, and their supervisors can authorize overtime payments. This bill will enable the Postmaster General to determine which positions require unsupervised and irregular overtime and thus correct an inequity. This legislation will give the Postmaster General the discretion to prescribe an annual premium pay differential for those employees of the postal field service whose duties preclude them from being included in the normal pattern applicable to overtime.

I would also like to point out that the

provision of the bill which would permit the computation of an inspector's pay on the basis of 260 days per year as compared to the present 312 days is only equitable. It will not increase the pay of an inspector but would, as in the case of the differential, put inspectors on the same basis as investigators in other agencies.

You and I have heard no great volume of complaints from our postal officials who have been left behind in the liberalization of premium pay for postal employees. This is a tribute to the conscientiousness of these employees. We must recognize our obligations and pass as quickly as possible this worthwhile legislation, for there is a need to have fair compensation among all levels of postal employees, especially when we have already established a precedent for such compensation in the laws relating to other Federal employees.

I urge the speedy passage of H.R. 14933.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, the responsibilities of our postal employees have been growing at a phenomenal rate, and with these increasing duties have come extensive demands on each employee's free time.

These increasing demands for after-hour employee efforts require more flexibility than is now available to most postal employees. Our present provisions do not meet the needs of today because there are too many restrictions. These restrictions are adjusted quite properly, I believe, in H.R. 14933, recently reported out of committee.

Briefly, this legislation authorizes the Postmaster General to pay a percentage differential of basic compensation to certain postal field service employees serving in selected positions. These jobs are those in which the hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively, and which require substantial amounts of irregular, unscheduled, overtime and night, Sunday or holiday duty. Under the terms of this bill, the employees would be responsible for recognizing, without supervision, circumstances which require them to remain on such duty.

Postal operations are 7-day-a-week, 24-hour-a-day activities, although we do not normally think of our mail service in these terms. Frequently overlooked are the activities of the inspectors who rush to the scene of a plane disaster to secure all available mail or relentlessly search to secure the return of lost or stolen packages. Providing adequate mail service during these times certainly requires more than the routine observance of the 8-hour day.

Congress made some attempts to provide for special overtime conditions during 1965, but this was merely an effort to allow the postal employees to catch up with the provisions already in effect for the workers employed under the General Schedule of the Classification Act. Provisions for persons filling positions requiring substantial amounts of unscheduled work were made in the General Schedule during 1954, and amended by increasing the percentage last year.

It is extremely important for Congress

to now make similar provisions for persons employed in the Postal Field Service.

I urge your support for the timely provisions embodied in H.R. 14933.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the portion of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, under the heading "Hours of Work and Overtime" is amended by adding immediately following section 3577 thereof the following new section:

"§ 3578. Irregular, unscheduled, overtime differential

"(a) The Postmaster General may provide premium pay to employees subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule other than—

"(1) postmasters,

"(2) employees referred to in section 3581 of this title,

"(3) employees in salary levels PFS-16 and above, and

"(4) employees in regional offices in salary levels PFS-15 and below who are not exempted, under section 3575(a) of this title, from the provisions of section 3573 thereof, in positions in which the hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively and which require substantial amounts of irregular, unscheduled, overtime duty and duty at night, on Sundays, and on holidays, with the employee generally being responsible for recognizing, without supervision, circumstances which require him to remain on duty.

"(b) Premium pay under subsection (a) of this section shall—

"(1) be provided on an annual basis under conditions established by the Postmaster General in lieu of any other premium pay to which the employee otherwise may be entitled, and

"(2) be determined as an appropriate percentage, not less than 10 per centum nor more than 25 per centum, of such part of the rate of the employee's basic compensation as does not exceed the maximum pay step for salary level PFS-11.

"(c) An employee may be paid premium pay under this section only to the extent that the payment does not cause his aggregate rate of compensation for any pay period to exceed the maximum rate of salary level PFS-18."

"(b) That part of the table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, under the heading "Hours of Work and Overtime" is amended by adding—

"Irregular, unscheduled, overtime compensation."

immediately below—

"3577. Workweek of postmasters in post offices of the first, second, and third classes."

Sec. 2. Section 3575 (a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Sections 3571, 3573, and 3574 of this title do not apply to postmasters, rural carriers, postal inspectors, employees in salary levels PFS-16 and above, and such employees in regional offices in salary levels PFS-15 and below as the Postmaster General designates."

Sec. 3. Section 3541 (d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "postal inspectors," in subparagraphs (3) and (4) thereof.

Mr. NIX (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that

the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 3, after "title," insert "and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, strike out line 5 and all that follows down to and including line 9.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the last committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 9, strike out "compensation" and insert in lieu thereof "differentiation".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NIX

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Nix: On page 3, line 1, strike out the word "maximum" and insert in lieu thereof the word "minimum."

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, it has been indicated that we are attempting to obtain comparability for a method of paying premium compensation for irregular and unscheduled overtime regardless of whether the employee is under the general schedule system or the postal field service system.

The maximum rate used as a basis for computing overtime for postal field service employees under 39 U.S.C. 3573(b) is the highest step of salary level PFS-11.

The bill now before us—H.R. 14933—uses this same standard of "the maximum pay step for salary level PFS-11" for determining the appropriate percentage for the irregular and unscheduled overtime.

However, the differential for other Government employees is computed pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5545(c)(2) on the rate of pay of the minimum step of GS-10.

I would agree that it would be appropriate to compute the overtime differential under this bill for those employees whose differential would be limited by salary level PFS-11 on the basis of the minimum pay step of PFS-11 rather than on the maximum step.

The Post Office Department has no objection to this amendment.

This change could be accomplished by amending the bill on page 3, line 1, by striking out the word "maximum" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "minimum."

This change would result in a reduction in cost of over \$1 million.

It is estimated that 1,430 employees would be affected by this legislation, nearly all of whom are in levels above PFS-11. A computation showing the difference in cost figures is set forth below:

Cost based on PFS-11 rates, July 1968

Maximum rate	\$12,124
25 percent differential	3,031
Minimum rate	9,289
25 percent differential	2,322
Approximate cost for 1,430 employees:	
Maximum rate	4,300,000
Minimum rate	3,300,000

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix], only because it is in the right direction, but it certainly does not go far enough.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Nix].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 2, line 1, after the comma insert the following: "postal service officers, and real estate officers."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is quite simple.

The bill as written specifically excludes postmasters, road duty employees, and employees in levels 16 and above from the premium pay differentials. My amendment would additionally exclude postal service officers and real estate officers.

If a valid case can be made at all for the establishment of a premium pay bonanza for an elite corps of postal officials, I can see no justification whatever for including service officers and real estate officers.

These two categories of jobs are already among the real plums of the postal service. They are of recent vintage—created during the Eisenhower administration when the regional system was established. They were good jobs to begin with and they have gotten better with each pay raise.

Starting out in PFS level 10, paying a maximum now of \$10,558, postal service officers quickly move up the levels to PFS level 15, which now pays \$17,295 in the top step. Interestingly, there are now only 10 postal service officer positions in level 10—only 62 in level 12. There are more in level 15 than in any other level—a total of 125.

Real estate officers are an even more elite breed. They start in level 14, which pays up to \$15,668, and move rapidly to level 15. Of the total 92 real estate officers in the country only 18 are in level 14 while 74 are in level 15.

I repeat these are already good jobs. They are prestige positions at the management level. These officers are empowered to control their own hours of work and I am confident that, except in rare emergencies, they do so very well.

They are now paid attractive salaries to compensate for any erratic hours of work. They are reimbursed for expenses incurred and when required to travel away from home, they receive per diem of \$16 per day. For every vacancy that occurs there are literally hundreds of eager applicants waiting in line.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I vigorously oppose giving these two classes of employees an extra yearly "premium" of more than \$3,000 in addition to their already good salaries. I urge that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, despite my high regard and deep respect for the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, I am nevertheless constrained to oppose the amendment, and I rise in opposition to the amendment for the reason that the purpose of the gentleman's amendment is to exclude certain employees from the premium pay provisions of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment would be to deny this pay to people in these categories even though they perform extra service.

A postal service officer is a trouble-shooter for the Post Office Department who works in a several-State region. His work is devoted to the solving of transportation and distribution problems in the post office. His job is to end bottlenecks in mail distribution when they develop. He must be on the job and end the tieup because the mail will continue to pour into the postal system. We all have in mind the problem that occurred in Chicago when the distribution of mail by the Chicago post office was stopped because of the sheer abundance of it. This is the kind of problem that must be settled immediately. As a result, postal service officers work around the clock, they travel extensively, and they must work alone.

There was some discussion in the full committee about the nature of the work of postal service officers. Some of the members felt that their main function was to act as public relations men. I was curious about that and asked the Post Office Department to provide a breakdown for me on the work of these men. It turns out that less than 1 percent of their work is devoted to public relations. The great majority of time is devoted to the internal operation of the Post Office. I will submit the breakdown on this for the Record and a breakdown on the work of real estate officers.

If this legislation is amended so that postal service officers or real estate officers are excluded from coverage under the bill, the Department undoubtedly would feel required to pay overtime at the rate of time and a half under existing law, or as an alternative, cut them back to a 40-hour week and hire a larger number of these men to make up for the loss of 10 extra hours per week that they now contribute. Either alternative is unacceptable because of the expense involved and because of the nature of the work required of these employees.

I do not like to disagree with my friend from Iowa, but I have to ask that the

House reject his amendment, and I believe the record supports my position.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose any proposal to add provisions to this bill exempting from the premium pay differentials a class or group of employees who, by the very nature of their work, should be entitled to the benefits of this legislation.

The legislation does exclude postmasters, road duty employees, and employees in salary levels PFS-16 and above. There is ample justification for these exclusions, either because they are covered by other provisions of law, as are the road duty employees, or because they perform management functions and should not be entitled to any overtime benefits.

The postal service officers have been working an average 56-hour workweek, the real estate officers over 50 hours per week, and the postal inspectors nearly 53½ hours per week. I fail to see how we can give the benefits of this legislation to one group and not to another.

The primary purpose of this legislation is to update the benefits for postal field service employees, and give them equal treatment with regard to the benefits enjoyed by the majority of our Government employees since 1954.

Under this proposal, postal inspectors will be entitled to the same premium pay differentials for irregular and unscheduled overtime as FBI agents have been getting for several years.

I must oppose the exclusion of any group of employees performing irregular overtime work, who clearly are entitled to the benefits of the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POOL

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POOL: On page 2, line 4, after "PFS" strike out "16" and insert "17".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would raise the PFS-16 to PFS-17 on page 2, line 4.

The reason for the amendment is that the PFS schedule shows a 16 making \$14,564. A 16 sounds like a high grade, but if you compare it with the general standard of Government employees, you will find that those between GS-13 and 14 make about the same as the 16 in the PFS Service. Therefore, I think the level should be raised to be in accordance with other Government employees. This is a fair and simple amendment. It would not cost the Government much, because in the higher grades there are not too many officers involved. It will not cost a great deal.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chair-

man, again I am reluctant to oppose the amendment, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, but the salient feature of this amendment is that it would increase the cost to an amount by which we just reduced the cost by the last amendment that was accepted by this committee.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, the proposition that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman in the well, has presented to the House is that what we are proposing is to have a uniform rule, comparable to the classified service. We want the postal service to be treated in the same way as the classified service. Is that not exactly the proposition of the gentleman?

Mr. NIX. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the point my amendment is making. If we will read the Public Law 90-206, providing pay scales for the general service, on page 12 we read that this falls between a GS-13 and GS-14, and this would be the same, the PFS-16. That is what I am trying to do with the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply compound the bad situation that already exists. This would put PFS-16's under the bill; and it would run the same kind of compression through the 17's and 18's and 19's and 20's and 21's. This does absolutely nothing except increase the price tag on the bill. It cures none of the inequity.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is in response to my dear friend, the gentleman from Texas. The proposition presented by the gentleman in the well is that there would be no overtime pay beyond the PFS-16, which is the same as the GS-15. That is exactly what we are doing, to make them absolutely comparable. That is what we want to hold fast to. We want to reject the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. Is that correct?

Mr. NIX. That is correct.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman has quoted this correctly, if I may be allowed to disagree with the gentleman from Montana. It shows on the PFS-16's \$14,564; and on the grade GS-13, it is \$13,507; and on the GS-14, it is \$15,841. So this figure is in between those two figures. That is the point I have been making with the amendment. I do not think we should be unfair. I think we should be comparable to the GS schedules, just as we are with industry. That is what I am trying to do

with the amendment, and it will not cost very much.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we are in agreement.

Mr. POOL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. But we are against the amendment of the gentleman, because by July 1 of this year the schedules will be the same, and we will be entirely in agreement. The gentleman in the well [Mr. Nix] is presenting opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, because we want the classified general service and the postal field service to be exactly comparable, and that is precisely what is being presented. I want the gentleman from Texas to know this is before us with the best of advice, that we are correct in saying this will be equal, and we are resisting the amendment offered.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I hope the prediction comes true. But, in the meantime, we are dealing with an aspect that is out of proportion. It is not true now, and there is injustice to these people, and I think we should be fair and reasonable, and this amendment will correct that.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I would just close my remarks by saying I think it is unwise to restore the \$1 million which this House in its wisdom has just eliminated.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIX. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. There are many who have reservations on this bill as it is. I am sure the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would be just the thing that would swing this over on the other side. We are upstairs at the present time considering the Post Office Department budget, which runs over \$6 billion. We have enough problems without compounding them further by adding to the cost.

Furthermore, no one can tell what the gentleman's amendment will cost. I think this should be done—if it is to be done at all—in committee, where we can get some cost figures.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I must say I thought I had detected, when I started out, an inequity. I thought the gentleman from Iowa agreed with me. Now he says this is a bad amendment, trying to rectify this discrepancy with reference to the PFS level 16.

I am trying to seek information. As I understood the gentleman from Iowa, when he discussed the bill, he stated that a 14 or 15 under the bill could make more than a 16. Is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. CASEY. If this is the wrong cure, perhaps we should reduce the maximum that may be paid from PFS-18. Let us attack it in that direction, so there will not be so much differential.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There is no place to break this thing off without compounding the felony, figuratively speaking. One would have to go clear through 21. That still would not cure it.

Mr. CASEY. Suppose we leave it at 16. I was wondering about reducing the total amount that may be paid, on page 3, line 6. We could reduce that level 18 to a lower figure. Would that make it a little less harsh on the level 16?

Mr. GROSS. No, because as I understand it no one gets that much out of the bill. This would not correct it either.

Mr. CASEY. No one gets how much out of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. PFS-18.

Mr. CASEY. It says an employee may be paid premium pay not to exceed the maximum rate of salary at level PFS-18.

Mr. OLSEN. Oh, that has been changed.

Mr. CASEY. No, it has not been changed.

Mr. GROSS. The rate has been changed, that is all.

Mr. CASEY. Does the gentleman mean no one is going to get paid overtime above a level 16?

Mr. GROSS. The most that anyone can get out of this bill is \$20,483, as I understand it.

Mr. CASEY. What level is that? Can anyone tell me?

Mr. GROSS. That would be the top of the 16 level.

Mr. CASEY. In other words, those at level 16 are not going to have someone at level 14 or 15 drawing more money than they do?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, there are those who are going to draw more money.

Mr. CASEY. Do all agree on that, now?

Mr. OLSEN. Not for the same hours.

Mr. CASEY. Not for the same hours.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, who has the floor?

Mr. CASEY. I have the floor, but I am getting many answers. They are not satisfactory, anyway.

I am going to support the gentleman's amendment, and see if they can work out those figures later. If it fails, I believe we ought to cut the maximum pay from PFS-18 down to 16, and make sure they do not draw more.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. I want to thank the gentleman for his support. I point out again it will allow those in 13, 14, and 15 to draw more pay than a 16. That is all I am doing, trying to rectify a mistake. It is a fair amendment.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

It is for the reason that we have worked it out in committee that the aggregate income in postal field service with overtime is going to be the same total aggregate income that can be paid comparatively in the classified service. We

are trying in this bill to have a uniform rule between the postal field service and the classified service. That is all we are trying to do.

There are some other evils or perhaps other ills that should be corrected, but we cannot do it here without making it lopsided as compared with the classified service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14933) to modify certain provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to hours of work and overtime for certain employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1085, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14933 to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 370, nays 14, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—370

Abbitt	Duncan	Latta
Abernethy	Dwyer	Leggett
Adair	Edwards, Ala.	Lennon
Adams	Edwards, Calif.	Lipscomb
Addabbo	Edwards, La.	Lloyd
Albert	Ellberg	Long, Md.
Anderson, Ill.	Erlenborn	Lukens
Anderson,	Esch	McCarthy
Tenn.	Eshleman	McClary
Andrews, Ala.	Evans, Colo.	McCloskey
Andrews,	Everett	McClure
N. Dak.	Evins, Tenn.	McCulloch
Annunzio	Farbstein	McDade
Arends	Fascell	McDonald,
Ashley	Feighan	Mich.
Ashmore	Findley	McFall
Aspinall	Fino	McMillan
Ayres	Fisher	Macdonald,
Barrett	Flood	Mass.
Bates	Flynt	MacGregor
Battin	Foley	Machen
Belcher	Ford, Gerald R.	Madden
Bell	Ford,	Mahon
Bennett	William D.	Marsh
Betts	Fraser	Martin
Bevill	Frelinghuysen	Mathias, Md.
Blester	Friedel	Matsunaga
Blackburn	Fulton, Pa.	May
Blanton	Fulton, Tenn.	Meeds
Blatnik	Fuqua	Meskill
Boggs	Gallagher	Michel
Boland	Gardner	Miller, Calif.
Bolling	Garmatz	Miller, Ohio
Bolton	Gathings	Minish
Bow	Gettys	Mink
Brademas	Gibbons	Minshall
Brasco	Gilbert	Mize
Bray	Gonzalez	Monagan
Brinkley	Goodell	Montgomery
Brock	Goodling	Moore
Brooks	Gray	Moorhead
Broomfield	Green, Pa.	Morgan
Brotzman	Griffiths	Morris, N. Mex.
Brown, Mich.	Gubser	Morton
Brown, Ohio	Gude	Mosher
Broyhill, N.C.	Gurney	Moss
Broyhill, Va.	Haley	Murphy, Ill.
Buchanan	Halleck	Murphy, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Halpern	Myers
Burke, Mass.	Hamilton	Natcher
Burleson	Hanley	Nedzi
Burton, Calif.	Hanna	Nelsen
Burton, Utah	Hansen, Idaho	Nix
Bush	Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara, Ill.
Button	Hardy	O'Hara, Mich.
Byrne, Pa.	Harrison	O'Konski
Byrnes, Wis.	Harsha	Olsen
Cabell	Hathaway	O'Neill, Mass.
Cahill	Hawkins	Ottenger
Carey	Hays	Passman
Carter	Hechler, W. Va.	Patten
Casey	Heckler, Mass.	Perkins
Cederberg	Helstoski	Pettis
Celler	Henderson	Philbin
Chamberlain	Hicks	Pickle
Clancy	Hollifield	Pike
Clark	Horton	Pirnie
Clausen,	Howard	Podell
Don H.	Hull	Poff
Cleveland	Hungate	Pollock
Cohelan	Hunt	Pool
Colmer	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
Conable	Ichord	Price, Tex.
Conte	Irwin	Pryor
Corbett	Jacobs	Pucinski
Corman	Jarman	Purcell
Cowger	Joelson	Quie
Cramer	Johnson, Calif.	Quillen
Culver	Johnson, Pa.	Railsback
Cunningham	Jones, Ala.	Randall
Curtis	Jones, Mo.	Rees
Daddario	Jones, N.C.	Reid, Ill.
Daniels	Karsten	Reid, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Karth	Reifel
Delaney	Kastenmeier	Reinecke
Dellenback	Kazen	Reuss
Denney	Kee	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dent	Keith	Rhodes, Pa.
Derwinski	Kelly	Riegle
Devine	King, N.Y.	Rivers
Dickinson	Kirwan	Roberts
Diggs	Kleppe	Robison
Dingell	Kluczynski	Rodino
Dole	Kornegay	Rogers, Colo.
Donohue	Kupferman	Rogers, Fla.
Dorn	Kyros	Ronan
Dow	Laird	Rooney, N.Y.
Downing	Landrum	Rooney, Pa.
Dulski	Langen	Rosenthal

Rostenkowski	Staggers	Watkins
Roudebush	Stanton	Watson
Roush	Steiger, Ariz.	Watts
Roybal	Steiger, Wis.	Whalen
Rumsfeld	Stephens	Whalley
Ryan	Stratton	White
St Germain	Sullivan	Whitener
Sandman	Taft	Whitten
Satterfield	Talcott	Widnall
Saylor	Taylor	Wiggins
Schadeberg	Teague, Calif.	Williams, Pa.
Schneebeli	Tenzer	Willis
Schweiker	Thompson, Ga.	Willson, Bob
Schwengel	Thompson, N.J.	Willson
Scott	Thomson, Wis.	Charles H.
Shipley	Tiernan	Winn
Shriver	Tuck	Wolf
Sikes	Tunney	Wright
Sisk	Udall	Wyatt
Slack	Ullman	Wylder
Smith, Calif.	Van Deerlin	Wylle
Smith, Iowa	Vander Jagt	Yates
Smith, N.Y.	Vigorito	Young
Smith, Okla.	Waggonner	Zablocki
Snyder	Waldie	Zion
Springer	Walker	Zwach
Stafford	Wampler	

NAYS—14

Ashbrook	Hammer-	Mills
Collier	schmidt	Poage
Davis, Wis.	Jonas	Rarick
Gross	Kyl	Scherle
Hall	Mayne	Skubitz

NOT VOTING—48

Baring	Hagan	Pepper
Berry	Harvey	Resnick
Bingham	Hébert	Roth
Brown, Calif.	Herlong	Ruppe
Clawson, Del.	Holland	St. Onge
Conyers	Hosmer	Scheuer
Dawson	King, Calif.	Selden
de la Garza	Kuykendall	Steed
Dowdy	Long, La.	Stubblefield
Eckhardt	McEwen	Stuckey
Edmondson	Mailliard	Teague, Tex.
Fallon	Mathias, Calif.	Utt
Fountain	Morse, Mass.	Vanik
Galifianakis	Nichols	Wyman
Gialmo	O'Neal, Ga.	
Green, Oreg.	Patman	
Grover	Pelly	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Mailliard.
 Mr. Galifianakis with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. King of California with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Wyman.
 Mr. Vanik with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Del Clawson.
 Mr. Selden with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Morse.
 Mr. Fountain with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Mathias of California.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Kuykendall.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Roth.
 Mr. Resnick with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Herlong.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Holland.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Brown of California.
 Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Bingham.
 Mr. Hagan with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. de la Garza.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NICE PLUG FOR TOM MORGAN

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the role of Congress in the shaping of our Nation's foreign policy is a subject greatly debated and little understood. The check and balances between the executive and legislative branches, and between the bodies of the Congress are constantly changing, and constantly the concern of us all.

A key to the understanding of the House's part in our foreign affairs may be found in the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania. Each congressional committee works differently, and the present stature and effectiveness of the Foreign Affairs Committee are the results of "Doc" MORGAN's very able and responsible leadership.

The Ambassador's Congressional Courier, a select newsletter designed to give the representatives of other nations an understanding of our system of Government, noted:

Before World War II the House Committee on Foreign Affairs used to be a minor Committee. Not anymore. Columnist William W. White identified Representative Morgan as "one of the good guys" in the 89th Congress "whose wise and adult conduct of the Committee. Not any more. Columnist William W. standing it has not held for a century or more."

The career and achievements of Chairman MORGAN are presented well in an article which appeared in the February 1968 issue of the Ambassador's Congressional Courier, and I commend this fine appraisal to the attention of my colleagues:

A KEY MEMBER—TO KNOW BETTER—REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS E. MORGAN

Representative Thomas E. Morgan is called "a big man in the House" not because the Democrat from Pennsylvania towers over his colleagues at six feet two, and weighs in at 240 pounds, or not even because he is the Chairman of the growing-in-power Committee on Foreign Affairs, but because he has an abundance of political skill.

He's a party man and proud of it.

He's for Johnson right down the line and is pro-Union, Great Society, New Frontier, Fair Deal and New Deal. There's nothing of the maverick about this friendly, down-to-earth man, who is affectionately called "Doc" . . . dating back to his three years (1930-33) at the Detroit College of Medicine and Surgery. And he does have the calm air and patience of a country doctor when working with his committee of 35 members, all conscious of the complexities of the foreign policies of the United States.

He doesn't look like, talk or act as one would expect of a chairman of this particular committee dealing with world diplomacy.

His counterpart in the Senate, the erudite J. William Fulbright, offers a striking comparison, not only because the Senator from Arkansas differs with the President on Vietnam policy and is not cooperative with the White House on some other foreign policy matters.

Fulbright could be mistaken for an ambassador, Morgan never.

The best way to judge the effectiveness of "Doc" Morgan is by his record as Committee Chairman. No one can say, for example, that the 1967 foreign aid bill did not have sufficient hearings. Seldom does a Committee spend four months on a single legislative bill. And there were no complaints about a lack of information. The record of the hearings filled 1,400 pages of print.

Before World War II the House Committee on Foreign Affairs used to be a minor Committee. Not anymore. Columnist William W. White identified Representative Morgan as "one of the good guys" in the 89th Congress "whose wise and adult conduct of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has given it a standing it has not held for a century or more."

There's a recent example of his political know-how in protecting the jurisdiction of his Committee. The latest hearings in progress on East-West trade are taking place under the subcommittee chairmanship of Edna Kelly (D-New York) not only because, as he says, "the entire subject needs exposure," but because he wants this kind of legislation to remain in his committee. Only last year an attempt was made to set up a special East-West Committee outside the purview of his committee. He stopped it.

Every Congressional Committee works differently. The method is pretty much up to the Chairman. "Doc" Morgan runs a tight ship. He gets reports, good and bad, from the ranking Republican Frances Bolton (R-Ohio) who meets regularly with the minority members. He calls her "hard working" and praises her "real bipartisan approach to international issues."

"Doc" Morgan has painful arthritis causing swelling of the knuckles on his hands. Mrs. Bolton asked him one day why he didn't see a "good" doctor meaning herself! "Doctor Bolton" believes in exercise. After all at 82 she can stand on her head but doesn't as often as she used to! She told her colleague to massage his fingers frequently and soak them often in hot water. So today you can find the robust, healthy-looking Morgan frequently rubbing his fingers as he talks. He has reported to "Doctor Bolton" that he feels somewhat better because of the massage.

There's mutual respect between these two, but also a certain wariness, which is probably good for the progress of the Committee's work.

Like other Committee Chairmen on Capitol Hill, the 61-year old Morgan is a product of the seniority system and a safe district. Politics is "in my blood," he says, and its of the organizational, responsible, traditional variety of politics.

His father was William Morgan, a transplanted Welsh coal miner, who was active in organizing the United Mine Workers in the coal fields. All his three sons took a keen interest in local politics. But "Doc" Morgan had his sights on national political office. He bided his time practicing medicine until the right opportunity came along to make the plunge. He was elected to represent the 26th Congressional district in the Southwest corner of the state in 1944 and has an easy time getting re-elected.

He doesn't let his Committee duties interfere with his interests in his local district or state. "I'm for anything that will bring a dollar into Pennsylvania," he says.

Does he support the President on Vietnam? "Yes," he answers in his flat steady voice and forthright manner.

One day in the Committee he bluntly said: "I just want to say that in light of conditions in South East Asia; in light of the criticism that has been made here on the Floor of the Congress of operations in Vietnam; in light of the great demand in the country to win over there, I think this Committee ought to oppose cutting a single dollar from this (foreign aid) program . . . every penny is needed in South Vietnam, Thailand and Laos. I am against cutting the guts out of our program in South East Asia."

President Johnson must have liked the backing the Congressman gave him, when he said, "Much depends how this program is used . . . and this involves the flexibility which we give to the President of the United States to conduct day to day operations under this statute." He added "there are many ways of crippling this program without cutting one penny from it . . . by loading it down with amendments and prohibitions which would immobilize it, and make it useless."

No wonder after the bill passed he received a "Dear Tom" letter from the White House in which the President wrote, "We owe you a vote of thanks for the Foreign Assistance bill that emerged from conference . . . the conference report stands as a tribute not only to your leadership and skill in bringing through the House an excellent bill, but also in your talents as a negotiator and diplomat."

"Doc" Morgan said one time: "The fundamental problem of the 120 or more independent countries in the world today is that a large percentage do not have capable governments or a reasonable number of people qualified to deal with political and economic problems. It is United States policy to develop and maintain friendly and cooperative relationships with these countries whether their governments are efficient or not."

Many members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs like "the extras" . . . those trips to far-away places and the Embassy parties. Neither of these advantages appeals to the physician from Pennsylvania. His few trips to Europe on Committee business included the dedication of a children's hospital in Poland, but he would rather journey to his hilltop home in Fredericktown, Pennsylvania. He doesn't dote on parties along Embassy row in Washington, but many diplomats have learned to respect and trust this Member of Congress from a district of Pennsylvania, populated by low-income workers, farmers, and diversified not only as to industry but also as to ethnic groups.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a highlight of the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held here in Washington is the Voice of Democracy contest from which we can always draw renewed confidence in the patriotism of young Americans.

The winner from Missouri this year was David Donelson of St. Joseph, Mo., in my congressional district. David's winning speech affirmed the willingness and ability of his generation to meet the challenge of freedom.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the speech by David Donelson:

Freedom's challenge has been hurled at youth. The quest for future leaders and out-

standing citizens has been thrown open with the hope that America's young people will answer the call. Freedom is challenging them to pick up where their parents left off.

The prospectus of the coming generation indicates that they will answer the challenge. The young people of today are better qualified than any previous generation to assume America's positions of leadership. Our youth are better educated in government and citizenship. They are well prepared to face America's problems because they have grown up surrounded by conflicts and hostilities. They are mature and responsible as evidenced by the large number of them in school.

But the challenge for forceful leaders and responsible citizens cannot be answered unless our youth are aware of it. All the evidence points to the fact that this generation is aware of the challenge. Freedom's challenge looms over youth as Shakespeare's ghosts loomed over evil characters in his plays. Every time they view America's breathtaking outdoors, whenever they see a city's concrete skyline etched against a reddening sky, everytime the school band crashes into the "Star Spangled Banner" Freedom's challenge overwhelms America's youth.

Freedom's challenge follows the student to school. When he sees the Stars and Stripes flying on the school grounds, when his teachers place in his hands the weapons of technology, literature, and understanding, the day begins to dawn, and the student sees that he must begin to act. When he is measured against men like Patrick Henry, John Marshall, and Frederick Douglass, he does rise and answer Freedom's challenge.

Young America hears, sees, and feels Freedom's challenge to them. They begin to answer the deep stirring in their hearts with vigorous applications of the education and training they have received. Our youth work on their own to learn the strengths and weaknesses of the American way of life. They experiment in private enterprise, dabble in high school politics, and show an active interest in current events.

The "Now" generation answers freedom's challenge by practicing freedom. The majority of them are busily developing open minds and respect for their fellow man. America's youth are becoming self-reliant and independent. They are forming strong moral codes and preparing to stand up for them.

Guidance in these noble endeavors is coming from the adult community. Civic youth groups, charity organizations, and youth-oriented churches are providing helpful experience and advice. Our young people are taking it all and coming back for more.

This generation of Americans will become responsible citizens and strong leaders. Freedom's challenge will not go unanswered. Twenty years hence, America will be in good hands, for America's youth are answering freedom's challenge.

CONTROLLING THE WATER POLLUTION MENACE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in his message on the environment "To Renew a Nation," gives special attention to a serious national problem—water pollution. The Congress also must devote special attention to this problem—in this session.

Water pollution is a blight on our na-

tional record of achievements. Every year, pollution destroys more rivers, lakes and marine waters. Every year it limits the recreation and economy they support. I join the President in his attack on "Polluted Water—No swimming" signs.

The Great Lakes and particularly Lake Erie struggle for their very existence against mounting wastes and human neglect.

President Johnson, in his comprehensive message on the American environment, presents a package of three important water pollution control proposals that will go a long way in serving the public's interest in clean water:

Oil pollution, a deadly contaminant of the Great Lakes and coastal waters, was dramatized again just a few days ago as an oil tanker sank off Puerto Rico, devastating waters and beaches. The Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Act of 1968, which builds on the legislation I sponsored in the House of Representatives last session—and which the other body passed—will provide new and more effective oil pollution controls.

Cities are faced with a serious backlog in municipal waste treatment plants to control water pollution. The President proposes an appropriation of \$225 million for the Federal construction grant program. More importantly, he offers a new supplementary financing program, through which the Federal Government would pay its share of a plant's cost by covering bond issued for the total project by the municipality. This new method of financing, combined with the existing program, will make \$1.8 billion available for treatment plants in fiscal 1969. Adoption of these proposals will permit the Federal Government to make a maximum contribution to construction in a year of necessary economy.

The third clean water element for the attention of Congress is the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1968. Safe drinking water is a right of all Americans and the the proposal should receive early attention.

I congratulate the President on his far-reaching proposals. He has clearly demonstrated that the administration has seized the initiative against pollution. I believe the Congress will join him.

SKYJACKING OF PLANES FROM FLORIDA TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent incidents of skyjacking of planes from Florida to Cuba has been of great concern to all Americans and particularly to Floridians. In the past several months, three American planes have been forced to fly to Cuba.

Fortunately, until last night the passengers who happened to be aboard have been returned safely to the United States. This still does not excuse the action, but at least anyone who wished to

return to the United States was given that opportunity.

But last night, Mr. Speaker, a commercial airliner was skyjacked and there is reason to believe that a passenger was detained in Cuba against his will—or in effect, kidnapped.

I have been in contact with the Cuban desk of the State Department and have been informed that the FBI is trying to ascertain whether or not that man was indeed kidnapped and if he was an American national.

I think this is a very grave matter, and I want to express my feeling on this right now. If that man was indeed kidnapped, the State Department should make immediate demand for his return.

For if we allow the first American citizen to become part of a Communist kidnapping plot, for whatever reason, there will be no assurance of safety on any plane in the skies anywhere.

There is a second point which I would like to make, one which I feel is a practical measure.

Each week we accept hundreds of Cubans from Communist Cuba to the safety and freedom of the United States. They have chosen to abandon their homeland and seek a new life in America rather than suffer the complete loss of personal freedoms under communism.

To do this they must apply, wait for long periods of time, and give up all their personal possessions. Yet they come at the rate of about 3,800 per month.

We have no such restrictions for our nationals who wish to leave this country. And I propose that any Cuban who seeks to go to Cuba can take one of the empty planes that fly to Cuba daily. We could indeed open up a "Good Riddance Flight" to Cuba to compliment the "Freedom Flight" that returns from Cuba with Cuban refugees.

The point I am making here is that any Cuban who wishes to live under a Communist dictatorship can take any number of flights to Cuba. They need not skyjack a commercial or private plane to accomplish the task. Any American national who wishes to live under the dictatorship of Fidel Castro can fly to Mexico and then fly to Cuba. In both cases without endangering the life of passengers or pilots.

But the Government of this Nation should go on record that it will not allow commercial or private planes to be high-jacked for political intrigue. This could lead to the abduction of free Cubans or Americans. This skyjacking must be stopped.

THE NORTH CASCADES: A PLAN FOR ALL PEOPLE

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the President's message to the Congress on conservation embodies a comprehensive blueprint to preserve as well as utilize our natural resources.

The message eloquently underlines the obvious: that we must take steps now to arrest and reverse the pollution of our air and water and the contamination of our soil. We must celebrate our natural resources with careful sensitivity.

I was pleased to note the President's recommendation that Congress approve a North Cascades National Park in my own State.

In 1967 Senator Jackson and I introduced identical bills to protect and develop the North Cascades. They are S. 1321 and H.R. 8970. The Senate, of course, has already passed S. 1321 with amendments. In just a few weeks the House Interior Committee will hold field hearings on H.R. 8970.

The development plan for the North Cascades answers the two conflicting criticisms made of the National Park Service, for the bill offers wilderness in conjunction with sound, multipurpose recreation.

The more than 670,000 acres proposed for the park and national recreation area includes some of the most primitive wilderness area remaining in the United States.

The spectacular pinnacles of the Picket Range and the majestic Eldorado Peaks country offer a breathtaking array of alpine scenery.

The North Cascades country is an untouched land of silent glaciers, unique geological features, and important ecological communities that must be preserved. The number of active glaciers in the North Cascades—more than 150 of them representing several types—is triple that in the remainder of the United States, including Alaska.

The hundreds of peaks in the proposed park offer the finest mountaineering opportunities in the country for professional climbers. Less strenuous challenges for hiking, camping, and sightseeing may be found in the region's canyons and lesser ridges.

The Congress has been rightfully concerned over the rising cost of land purchases for wilderness and park legislation. Passage of the President's plan to stimulate the land and water conservation fund will generate additional revenues to make needed purchases.

But most of the land scheduled for park and recreation area status in H.R. 8970 and S. 1321 is already federally owned. Wisely, the bills would allow present landowners to keep their property as long as it is used for purposes compatible with the park and with the recreation areas. The cost of land acquisition, therefore, would be very slight.

Creation of a North Cascades National Park, a Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and a Lake Chelan National Recreation Area will open up the Cascades to most of us who like to take our children and our cars on weekend vacations.

I am particularly impressed by the provision in the amended S. 1321 which calls for the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior to develop feasibility plans for permanent ski lifts in and near the park and recreation areas. Skiing is our most popular winter sport, and Park Service policy should encourage its growth in the Pacific Northwest.

Opening up the North Cascades to family recreation will also be accomplished through the following aspects of the Park Service development plan: three aerial tramways, a ferry service from Roland Point on Ross Lake up to Hozomeen, numerous lodges and marinas, dozens of campgrounds, another ferry service to quickly travel the length of Lake Chelan, and miles of marked trails.

When the North Cascades study report was released in January of 1966, the study team estimated that the park would generate annual visitor spending of more than \$20 million and would create employment for well over a thousand persons. In other words, the park and recreation areas will become "bread and butter" for Skagit, Whatcom, and Chelan Counties.

Passage of the park bill should give added impetus to completion of the north cross-State highway. Already financed 85 percent by Federal money, this scenic and commercial route would be eligible for additional appropriations should the park be established.

The North Cascades offer some of the country's most spectacular fishing, particularly Ross Lake with its large, fighting trout.

Unlike the situation involved with the proposed Redwoods National Park, the North Cascades Park would have little effect on timber companies. This is because the U.S. Forest Service has, for 30 years, declared nearly all the timber in the proposed park "out of bounds" to cutting.

We have before us a wonderful opportunity to invest a little money and be rewarded with wilderness as well as multi-purpose, family recreation. The North Cascade legislation presents an exciting challenge to Congress and offers a plan for all people.

POLAND'S COLLEGE STUDENTS NEED MORAL SUPPORT FROM THEIR AMERICAN COUNTERPARTS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the free world has been watching with considerable interest the heroic struggle now being waged in Poland by that country's young people against Communist oppression.

These young Poles who are risking their lives in the cause of freedom deserve the moral support of young people throughout the whole free world.

The courage of these young Polish college students compares with the courage of other young Poles who throughout the course of Poland's history have always been in the forefront in fighting for human dignity.

It was a group of young Polish college students who staged the heroic Poznar uprising in 1956, and again it was the

young Polish college students who triggered off the brave Warsaw uprising against the Nazis.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon college students throughout the United States to organize orderly rallies on their own campuses as quickly as possible to show their support for the brave and heroic efforts being made by the Polish students against communism in Poland.

We hear that young Americans are looking for a cause. Here is an ideal purpose and an inspiring cause behind which all Americans—young and old—can rally. Let the Communist regime in Warsaw hear the voice of young America; let it hear this voice loud and clear—that the young people of this country hold high in value the efforts of their counterparts in Poland in standing up to the bitter restrictions against freedom and democracy being imposed on the people of Poland by her Communist regime.

Let the freedom and democracy enjoyed by college students on American campuses become so infectious that it will sweep the entire Communist world.

I hope that young Americans will send their greetings and wishes for success to these young Polish heroes from every college campus in the United States.

Here is a cause that young Americans can support and through their support let the young Polish scholars know that they are not alone in their struggle against the oppression of communism.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON REMINDS THE NATION OF THE GREATNESS OF ITS HERITAGE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to attend ceremonies at the White House honoring two American heroes of the fighting in Vietnam.

I was there as President Johnson presented our Nation's highest award—the Medal of Honor—to two gallant marines.

And I was there to hear the President remind us of our responsibilities as citizens during this crucial and difficult time.

The President said:

This is an anxious time for America. It calls for every fiber of our courage, every resource of our intelligence, every capacity for sound judgment that the American people can summon—and that the American people possess.

And the President continued:

I think if we are steady, if we are patient, if we do not become the willing victims of our own despair, if we do not abandon what we know is right when it comes under mounting challenge—we shall never fail.

It is in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I insert in the RECORD President Johnson's stirring address:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE PRESENTATION OF MEDALS OF HONOR TO MAJ. ROBERT J. MODRZEJEWSKI, USMC, AND 2d LT. JOHN J. MCGINTY III, USMC, MARCH 12, 1968

Major and Mrs. Modrzejewski and family; Lieutenant and Mrs. McGinty and family; Secretary Ignatius; General Chapman, Commandant of the Marine Corps; distinguished Members of Congress; ladies and gentlemen:

We have just heard an extraordinary tribute to the courage of two men. They are Marines. They are comrades. They are heroes. But they are first and last—Americans.

In the story of their triumph, the voice of a people's character and a nation's greatness is brought before us. We should all understand that that is a voice with steel in it.

Last night I remembered another voice from another troubled and decisive time. I turned to the pages of a book where another President spoke to this nation in time of a war. He told of the stories of courage and heroism on far battlefields. He called for the same strength of character and staunchness of spirit in every American home here and in every American heart.

Said President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the early months of another Pacific war—"As we here at home contemplate our own duties and our own responsibilities, let us think, and let us think hard, of the example which is being set for us by our fighting men. Our soldiers and our sailors are members of well-disciplined units. But they are still and forever individuals—free individuals. They are farmers and workers, businessmen, professional men, artists, and clerks. They are the United States of America. That is why they fight. We, too, are the United States of America."

Americans loathed war in that day, too. Forced to fight a war, Americans were impatient and frustrated by setbacks.

President Roosevelt also spoke to that anxiety when he said, five months after Pearl Harbor, "We have had no illusions about the fact that this is a tough job—and a long one."

And this nation has no illusions now. This is an anxious time for America. It calls for every fiber of our courage, every resource of our intelligence, every capacity for sound judgment that the American people can summon—and that the American people possess.

I think if we are steady, if we are patient, if we do not become the willing victims of our own despair, if we do not abandon what we know is right when it comes under mounting challenge—we shall never fail.

Responsibility never comes easy. Neither does freedom come free.

These brave men whom we have asked to come here to the East Room today and whom we honor now, know that better than we, perhaps. They know in the most immediate way that men can ever know it. They know it in the face of an aggressor's fire.

Major Modrzejewski and Lt. McGinty stand in the long unbroken rank of heroes who have been this nation's pride and have been this nation's strength from the beginning when America itself as Lafayette once said "was a dream that every man carried in his heart."

Men like these Marines have seen America all through our troubled periods. They have fought with valor in the early months the enemy's expanded war, when the regular units of the North Vietnamese Army were beginning to cross the border as aggressors in significant size.

Today, the enemy force waging destruction south of the DMZ is made up of many regular units who have invaded their neighbor nation from the North. International aggression is open now and it is undisguised.

The early pretence of attempting to fool some of the people some of the time that this was only a civil war has now had the

cloak pulled from around it and even they have abandoned it, as have their spokesmen.

So let us have no illusions about that, either. And let no one ever suffer any illusions about the will and about the faith of free men, the American fighting man, the family of citizens who stand by him here and who stand by him out there.

Yes, we all loath war. Yes, we argue about war. But we are one people and we have learned the hard lesson of history.

President Franklin Roosevelt had to say it and he said it with a heavy heart. I must repeat it now and my heart is heavy, too.

"The price for civilization must be paid in hard work and must be paid in sorrow and in blood—and the price is not too high."

But my heart this morning is proud and it is confident, too. I look at these two gallant Marines and I see America. I see in their countenance the answer to aggression. I see in their face the certainty of freedom and I see in their presence the hope and the promise of peace.

THE SATISFACTORY CONDUCT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my satisfaction with the conduct of Secretary of State Dean Rusk as he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that as a Member on this side of the aisle, the easiest thing to do is to sit back and let the conflict that is raging on the other side of the Capitol, in the other body, go by unnoticed. However, I want to say that as one Member of this body, the House of Representatives of the United States, I am going to place my country ahead of anything else, including my political future.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is time that we in this Congress and the President leveled with the American people. It is time to tell the American people that the situation with which we are presently confronted in South Vietnam goes far beyond the issue of South Vietnam itself. The issue, Mr. Speaker, is whether communism is going to be the wave of the future in Southeast Asia. If we, as Members of this body fail to take into consideration what is happening in Thailand, what is happening in the Philippines, what is happening in Korea, what is happening in Laos and Cambodia, and near loss of Indonesia to the Communists, we will make a fatal mistake, a mistake which will haunt us for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we must face the facts and that the American people will have to face the facts which are involved. The issue is not only Vietnam. The issue is whether or not communism is going to prevail in Southeast Asia. Further, if we are going to have a viable South Vietnam, it will be the byproduct resulting from the defeat of communism in the area.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me at this point?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman from Michigan think we are safe in assuming that communism is split up into a group of unrelated and independent nations and peoples and that it has no common aggressive designs?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I believe one of the serious mistakes we can make is just this. I listened with interest to the gentleman from Illinois talking about the Polish students demonstrating, and the unrest that is taking place there. I believe this is a healthy sign in the Communist world. But let me say this: If there is a Communist victory, if we give up in Vietnam, this will be interpreted in the whole Communist world that we cannot stand up to the threat of communism. And if we do this, then we will be doing just as we did when we refused to believe that Hitler would do what he said he was going to do, and then he did it. We are familiar with this result.

So if we fail to do this now, to meet this issue, then it is on our own heads as Representatives of the American people. And as I read my mail—and I know that my mail, like the mail most of us receive, is not completely for this war—much of the mail says we ought to get out of Vietnam, but a lot supports the position I have mentioned that we are going to have to stand up for what we know is right, and we as the Representatives must interpret this in the responsible way because some of us are privy to information that other people do not have.

Therefore it seems to me that the time has come for the American people to be told—and I believe that the President ought to tell them—that the question is not that of Vietnam, it is the question of communism dedicated to the destruction of the free world, and we had better understand that.

I know there are many things I disagree with in the way that the administration has conducted the war, but I do believe that we had better get an understanding of what the situation is here, because if we do not it will be on our heads as Representatives of the American people—and regardless of what the political effect might be on me or anyone else, as far as I am concerned I am against allowing the Communists to take over Southeast Asia, or any place else, and if this is the only Nation in the world that has the wherewithal or fortitude to do the job then we have that responsibility, and if we do not assume it, who will?

May God grant us the wisdom to do what is right regardless of personal consequences.

RECENT POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA THAT ENDANGER THE NEW GOVERNMENT AND ITS NONPARTISAN BASIS

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when Walter Washington was nominated for the post of Mayor of Washington, D.C., the nomination was applauded by members of both political parties. Walter Washington was particularly qualified for the new post and to date has done a good job. He has been able to get the different segments of the District of Columbia community to work together to meet common problems. He has been able already to use his influence to dampen what could have been explosive situations.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disturbed about recent political developments in the District that in my opinion endanger the new government and its nonpartisan basis. What I am referring to is the White House attempt, through the Justice Department to have un-Hatched and made political the new Mayor, Mr. Washington. Apparently, and no one should be afraid to say it, is that the White House is using its influence to take advantage of a dedicated public servant's position to serve its own political interests. If this happens it will be a great handicap to the citizens of the District of Columbia as well as to those many loyal friends of District self-government who have struggled and worked through the years to make the District a better city. This city of all cities should be immune and insulated so far as possible from purely partisan and petty political interests.

There are many appeals I could make here today, but I will just make one, and that is to the President or whoever speaks for him or advises him on House matters. Leave Walter Washington alone. Allow him to be the leader of all the people, not just a faction in a political party. Let the District government grow and be nurtured in a healthy climate, uncorrupted by your or any other candidate's desperate search for convention delegates and votes. Let the District be a model for years to come as a government to which all may come and be served. Let us not taint what must become a beautiful and historic experiment in local self-government.

There will be many pains and hurts in the early years of this experiment, but nothing weighs more heavily so much against the District's own evolution toward full participating democracy as imposition from the outside of a narrow partisan demand having no relevance to District interests.

The early gains made toward full citizenship and basic rights as Americans will be jeopardized and defeated by such a deed.

Now I know Walter Washington, and know him as a man of all the people. Those great many individuals who support his appointment as leader of this Capital City knew what Walter Washington knew and knows today. It is a simple truth, and one neither we nor

President Johnson or his political friends can forget for a moment. The District is so beset by special interests and absentee voices that there must be at all times a delicate balance of local government machinery. This is not the time to upset that balance by turning the nonpartisan neutral leadership into a political cadre serving temporal White House political needs.

So my appeal is to the President and/or his advisers. Lift the heavy hand from Walter Washington's back. Do not take his time. The District needs him too badly. Let him continue to be a man of all the people of the District, a leader who can be humane, understanding, responsive, and responsible to every resident of the District. Do not make Walter Washington beholden to a political necessity.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS CONCERNING AIRBUS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the unanswered questions about the administration's actions on jet engines for the "airbus" continue to pile up. The latest information I have received seems to indicate once more that a position has been taken despite repeated denials.

Accordingly, I have today written to the Secretary of Transportation on the matter, and, for the information of the Congress, I include a copy of my letter in the RECORD at this point:

MARCH 13, 1968.

Subject: Government action regarding the airbus engines.

HON ALAN S. BOYD,
Secretary, Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you will recall, on Friday, March 8, I telephoned you about recent reports of government action to affect orders for jet engines for the "airbus" aircraft. You advised me that a meeting had recently taken place on the subject at which you had been present, as well as representatives of Defense, Treasury and, I believe, other departments of government. My understanding of your statement was that the meeting had resulted in a decision that the Federal Government has no authority to try to influence private concerns in placing orders for jet engines with either U.S. or foreign manufacturers. I further understood from you that no further steps had been taken or were being taken regard to inquiries about government attitudes made in this connection.

As you know, under date of March 6, as a joint signer with a number of United States Senators and other Members of the House of Representatives, I wrote to the President, to the Secretary of the Treasury and to you, requesting that a statement be made by the Government on its official position on the matter. As yet no action that I know of has been taken on this letter.

It has now come to my attention that, as a result of the meeting on February 6, which I presume to be the meeting that you described to me, contact was made by your Department with a representative of an air

frame producer stating that "the U.S. does look with some favor on the subject of the proposed cooperative program."

It would seem logical to think that the proposed "cooperative program" referred to was an engine order by the air frame manufacturer with Rolls Royce, a foreign manufacturer of jet engines.

In view of this information, I would appreciate a report confirming or denying that your Department took such action and describing the decisions of the interdepartmental meeting in question. It would also seem appropriate to renew the request in the letter of March 6, that the Government's position be stated. If there is an official or unofficial position, I believe the Congress and the public should be aware of it.

Because of the very serious balance of payments implications of the entire matter, I am sending a copy of this letter to the Honorable Wilbur Mills and the Honorable John Byrnes of the House Ways and Means Committee, as well as to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sincerely,

ROBERT TAFT, Jr.

EQUIPMENT INTERCHANGE ACT OF 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today, for proper reference, a bill to promote those transportation policies which have already given us the best transit system and the strongest economy in the world.

One of the eternal problems in the field of transportation is to assure that the laws covering interstate commerce provide the protections the public demands, but at the same time, take cognizance of the developing trends.

I am introducing the bill, to be known as the Equipment Interchange Act of 1968, at the request of the American Trucking Association and the Equipment Interchange Association, a voluntary association representing railroads, airlines, trucks, and water carriers. The bill is known as the Equipment Interchange Act of 1968, and a similar measure, S. 3134, was introduced a few days ago in the Senate by Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee.

It is felt that the tremendous containerization revolution taking place over the past few years calls for new procedures. The freight container has become the best means of handling many kinds and classes of shippers' traffic, and the state of the art is now so well developed that economic steps are necessary; the technology has advanced ahead of the law.

We now have the equipment to load a given product into a standard-size container; the container is then loaded on a truck for transport to a railhead; and finally, the container is transferred from a railcar to a containership for its final destination.

In spite of the expediency that could accompany this process, present law requires a separate bill of lading on each leg of the shipment, as well as the pay-

ment of the full published tariff on each leg. The benefits of direct routing are lost since there is no uniform procedure for handling this traffic, and considerable time and effort is wasted.

Certainly, there is a more economic process than fragmenting the shipment, and yet present law makes no provision for a reduction or reallocation of the cost. There is no ground on which the carriers can join together to make agreements for more expedient handling of these shipments or pass the resulting savings on to the shipping public.

I am advised that this bill will help to encourage and facilitate the use of containers which can be loaded with freight on one type of carrier and moved to destination by one or more other types of carriers, without unloading the container or trailer. If this is so, the result would be of great benefit; it would make shipping faster, it would reduce the breakage element and it would set the scene for reduced shipping rates.

Collaboration among the carriers from the different modes in arriving at charges for the use of containers, including highway trailers, has long been deferred and is long overdue, because of the possibility of antitrust violation.

This legislation creates a three-man board, composed of the Chairmen of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission. The function of this board will be to consider the agreements submitted by carriers, and to assure that they are fair and that they promote the national transportation policy.

When an agreement has been so approved, carriers may operate under it without threat of reprisal of the antitrust laws.

In other transportation situations, the Congress has provided for antitrust law exemption to carriers operating under Government-approved agreements. Such situations embrace agreements for procedures to arrive at rates charged to the public. The new bill, however, applies only to charges between the carriers themselves for actual use of equipment.

When so much of our national effort is commendably being expended to remove barriers to trade, this Nation should act to remove this barrier to permit the broadest spectrum of carriers to move the freight of the Nation and the world. Our own shippers should not be hampered, nor the movement of their freight delayed, because we have failed to open the way for cooperation between carriers under agreements cleared by existing Federal agencies.

The equipment interchange bill is designed to remove this barrier to business. Additionally, the bill should prove to be a direct aid to the shipping public, including the Government, and to the several modes of freight transportation.

REVISING INCOME TAX LAWS

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation to remove an inequity that has been allowed to exist for over three decades.

I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, about the \$600 exemption allowed to our citizens under present income tax laws. For over three decades this exemption, which was to have some relationship to the cost of living for each member of a family, has remained the same while, as all of us are acutely aware, the cost of living during this same period has approximately tripled.

Therefore, I would like to add my name to the list of Members who have already sponsored legislation to increase this exemption from \$600 to \$1,200.

While I realize the need of revenue at this particular time, I am also cognizant of what could eventually be realized through this legislation.

In addition to removing a glaring injustice, this legislation would make more income available to the head of a household for use in educating and raising his children—a responsibility that has too often been assumed by the Government in the form of expensive and ever-expanding welfare programs. This legislation, I believe, would help to reduce the number of welfare participants in the future.

Also, in regard to the head of a household, I would like to express my support of legislation to assist those unmarried people who are in actuality the head of a household but, for tax purposes, are not treated accordingly. It seems quite reasonable that an unmarried person who maintains his or her own home should be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household. Therefore, I would at this time like to cosponsor legislation toward this end.

VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, this week a number of my senior colleagues have joined or will join in various resolutions urging that the future course of our policy in Vietnam be debated and determined by Congress rather than by the Johnson administration. In effect, these resolutions recognize a failure in present leadership in the White House and insist on the assumption of leadership by the Congress itself, at least with respect to the single issue of whether or not the present U.S. effort in Vietnam should be further escalated. I would like to join in the sense of these proposals and urge that the Constitution itself furnishes the impelling reasons for immediate action by the House of Representatives.

In this vein, I would call attention to some of the specific language in that document which has earned the respect

and reverence of the world for its checks and balances on the excessive exercise of executive power.

First, while the President is expressly designated as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy—article II, section 2—Congress is given the sole power to declare war and to raise and support armies which will fight that war—article I, section 8.

Second, the framers of the Constitution significantly limited the appropriation power for armed forces to a period of 2 years—article I, section 8. Bills for raising revenues were required to be initiated in the House of Representatives—article I, section 7.

By these significant limitations, the powers of declaring and financing war were clearly put within the power and control of those elected representatives closest to the people, individuals who would be required to face the people for election every 2 years rather than every 4 or 6. With these powers goes an accompanying duty. Congress should not sit idly by and be forced into ex post facto war appropriations, thereby abdicating its essential power and duty to set priorities for domestic and foreign policy expenditures.

That Congress shares responsibility with the Chief Executive is further indicated by the constitutional provision that the President is required to recommend to Congress such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient—article II, section 2. Today the President pursues measures first and then seeks congressional approval through individual bills and appropriations necessary to implement them. Free foreign investment, trade, and travel are subordinated to increasing Vietnam expenditures. Granted that foreign policy requires Executive decisions which may not always permit full advance public disclosure, the magnitude of the current issue of escalation in Vietnam is one which at least justifies full and comprehensive deliberation by the Congress. To permit less is to abdicate our constitutional duty.

We do not fight a war so much as we conduct a foreign policy of assisting South Vietnam.

I would, therefore, join in the sense of resolutions offered by a number of other Members, and offer the following resolution for consideration.

That it is the sense of the Congress that:

(1) The commitment of U.S. Armed Forces in Vietnam should not be increased, nor the theater of operations broadened, without the explicit prior consent of the Congress.

(2) Until such consent, U.S. foreign policy should recognize the goal of an early reunification of Vietnam by an orderly process consistent with the Geneva Accords of July 21, 1954.

(3) This goal recognizes the fundamental principle that Vietnam is one country, not two, and that it remains the policy of the United States to obtain an early reunification of countries divided against their will, not to insist on the permanent establishment of a separate new nation of South Vietnam.

CELEBRATION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL HOLIDAYS ON MONDAYS

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for the celebration of certain national holidays on Mondays. Joining me as cosponsors are the following Members: SAMUEL S. STRATTON, PETER W. RODINO, JR., WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, JAMES C. CORMAN, HENRY P. SMITH III, DON EDWARDS, THOMAS J. MESKILL, CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR., WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, HERBERT TENZER, ANDREW JACOBS, JR., JOSHUA EILBERG, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, and FRANK ANNUNZIO.

It will be recalled that subcommittees of both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees held hearings on uniform Monday holiday legislation last session. As a result of the House hearings—in which overwhelming testimony was adduced in support of Monday holiday legislation—H.R. 11679, a previous Monday holiday bill sponsored by me, was reported to the full committee. The committee considered this bill twice in executive session, but failed to report a final bill to the House before adjournment of the first session. H.R. 11679 is still pending before the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent that the Congress act soon to approve some form of Monday holiday legislation. The popularity of observing certain national holidays on appropriate Mondays has been reliably demonstrated. In a poll conducted by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, with nearly 10,000 members responding, support for uniform Monday holidays came from 85 percent of the chamber members. In a later survey conducted by This Week magazine, 180,061 ballots were returned in favor of Monday holidays, with only 10,094 opposed—an indicated support of 95 percent.

I need not recount to the House the advantages of Monday holiday legislation. The benefits were clearly brought out by witnesses at the House and Senate hearings. What is particularly significant, I believe, is the broad range of support for this legislation. In addition to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the readers of This Week magazine, strong support for Monday holidays has come from the American Federation of Government Employees AFL-CIO, the Air Transport Association, the American Hotel and Motel Association, the National Association of Letter Carriers AFL-CIO, the National Association of Motor Bus Owners, and the National Association of Travel Organizations—to name but a few groups. The Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and the U.S. Civil Service Commission also have endorsed the Monday holiday bills considered by the House subcommittee.

It is my hope that the Monday holiday bill now pending before the full Judiciary Committee can be recommended in a form substantially similar to the revised bill which I am introducing today. Without disturbing Independence Day or Thanksgiving Day, this revised measure would authorize the observance of

George Washington's Birthday on the third Monday in February, Memorial Day on the last Monday in May, Columbus Day on the second Monday in October, and Veterans Day on the fourth Monday in October.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize the serious danger of confusion and disappointment if congressional action on Monday holiday legislation is delayed.

At present there are Monday holiday bills pending in 8 State legislatures—Arizona, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. A poll of the 50 States, conducted by my office, showed only 4 State Governors of the 32 responding as indicating any opposition to Monday holiday legislation. Indeed, several States have taken or are about to take steps toward enactment of some form of Monday holiday legislation.

Recently the State of Massachusetts adopted a Monday holiday bill calling for the observance of Monday holidays for the following days: George Washington's Birthday, Patriot's Day, and Memorial Day. The New York State Legislature now has at least two Monday holiday bills before it, one of which has passed the New York House of Representatives, and the other of which is awaiting action in the State Senate. These bills would provide Monday holidays for George Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Veterans Day, and Thanksgiving Day. Note that the inclusion of Independence Day and Thanksgiving Day in the New York legislation would place New York in a different position from the rest of the Nation if the bill pending in the House Judiciary Committee is passed in the form which I have recommended.

Mr. Speaker, in the past, the action of the U.S. Congress has served as a guide to the rest of the Nation as to the appropriate days for observance of national holidays. The Congress should continue to assume this responsibility. It is expected that most of the States would follow the Federal initiative. However, this initiative should be exercised promptly in order to avoid the possible confusion which could come from the States acting independently in the enactment of Monday holidays.

AUTO INSURANCE NEEDS OVERHAUL TO CURE ITS ILLS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a characteristic trait of the American people that they never hesitate to speak out against anything they consider unfair or unjust.

At the moment, hundreds of thousands of people throughout the country are complaining about what they consider unfair practices of automobile insurance companies. Some people report that their auto insurance was canceled

when they had a single minor accident—after 20 or more years of completely safe driving. Many families believe that their auto insurance rates are excessive.

This is a matter of great concern and importance to the public.

I believe that Congress should investigate this matter and take appropriate action to protect the public.

I am including an article by Paul Lilley, published in the Cleveland Press of March 11, 1968, which spotlights the problem. Although the writer says that a solution to the problem "won't come soon," it is my belief that, unless the auto insurance companies themselves come up with some reforms in the near future, Congress should seriously consider early legislative action.

The article reads as follows:

AUTO INSURANCE NEEDS OVERHAUL TO CURE ITS ILLS

(By Paul Lilley)

Automobile insurance has become a national issue.

Nobody seems satisfied with it.

Not millions of car owners who buy it. Not the companies that sell it. Not the state agencies that regulate it.

Consumer outrage over high costs, delayed claim settlements and unexplained cancellations has stirred President Johnson and both houses of Congress to call for investigations.

Only one thing is certain:

Revolutionary concepts, radical legislative changes and modernization of legal procedures will be necessary to solve the auto insurance dilemma. The solution may be found in:

State control of the industry under a plan similar to workmen's compensation.

Federal regulation and control of the multi-billion-dollar-a-year business.

Steps to remove automobile injury cases from the courts in all but rare exceptions.

Speedy payment for injuries and damages suffered, no matter who is at fault.

Whatever the solution—it won't come soon.

What started out to be general protests against skyrocketing costs now has escalated into a national demand for complete overhaul of the industry because of:

Controversial underwriting practices.

Arbitrary policy cancellations, refusals to renew and shifting of customers into high-risk categories.

Geographical, racial and economic blackouts in insurance coverage.

Years of waiting for payment of justified claims.

These are but some of the complaints flooding legislators in every level of government. They are coming from the poor and the rich, whites and Negroes, young and old, the professionals and the uneducated.

Although hundreds of complaints are found to be unjustified, thousands of others are proven true.

Such as the unwarranted policy cancellation of a Warrensville Heights youth, based on false and malicious statements of an irritated neighbor.

Or the southern Ohio school teacher who lost her policy after a \$215 damage claim against her. She now pays \$800 a year in "high risk" liability premiums.

Or the two-car families who pay \$500 a year for auto insurance.

Or the Georgia family whose insurance was arbitrarily canceled by a Providence, R.I., company because a son had been drafted. Young draftees are considered "high risks."

So are doctors and clergymen because they are said to be "preoccupied drivers." Divorcees, too, are insurance-snubbed because

they tend to irk women jurors in the event of a trial.

Many of the nation's larger insurance companies are aware of the increasing demand for federal control.

Many freely admit something must be done, but say they would vigorously oppose federal control. This could open the door for control over other phases of the insurance business.

Perhaps the most popular solution is that proposed by two law professors, Robert E. Keeton of Harvard University and Jeffrey O'Connell of the University of Illinois.

Their Basic Protection Insurance (BPI) would make automobile insurance compulsory for every car owner, and would automatically compensate accident victims regardless of fault.

The immediate response to this proposal was NO from attorneys throughout the nation whose lucrative personal injury and liability cases represent a large portion of their work.

Their contingency fees range from 25% to 33% for settlement of a case and up to 50% if it goes through trial and appeal.

Fortune magazine estimates that one-third of the income of the nation's lawyers—about \$650,000,000 in 1966—comes from automobile accident cases.

But now even the nation's attorneys believe some action must be taken to provide immediate compensation for innocent victims.

Only last month the American Bar Assn. authorized a full-scale study of auto accident liability claim procedures.

ABA President Earl Morris said the study group would consider all aspects of the insurance problem and would recommend any solution it deemed best—even an insurance-type procedure to replace jury trials resulting from auto accidents.

RESULTS OF CUTBACK IN DOMESTIC SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, all last year this House debated about downgrading and reducing domestic expenditures. It was said by many that we could not afford to have domestic programs while a war was going on, and demands were made again and again for a 5- or 10-percent across-the-board budget reduction. Finally in December, the House approved House Joint Resolution 888, which directed that all domestic programs reduce their spending. Now we are beginning to see the effects of this resolution and they are not good.

The House committed a major blunder in approving House Joint Resolution 888. In the first place, the resolution demanded a straight, across-the-board reduction in programs—without regard to exactly how this could be accomplished without creating waste and inefficiency, without regard in other words, for any sensible action at all. Not only did the resolution fail to heed the most elementary commonsense, the most fundamental requirements of governments, but it was actually a repudiation of earlier House actions. The resolution impeached the very judgment of the House by saying in effect that our appropriations bills were not valid, our judgment not sound, our decisions and considered actions not sound.

The effects of all of this are now beginning to be felt. Programs which we urgently need are going down into a sea of confusion and waste caused by mandatory reductions and last-minute budget surgery. Agencies are throwing out millions of dollars worth of investment in order to save a few hundred thousand dollars of current expenditures. State and local governments which had planned on, expected and badly needed Federal assistance now find that it is not available, and that very often, commitments made by the Federal Government can no longer be fulfilled.

In higher education, federally assisted construction is drastically reduced, even though college enrollments are growing at a record pace.

In secondary school construction, classrooms remain overcrowded because there is no money to pay for new facilities.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any one indispensable, if there is any one essential domestic activity of Government it is in the field of education. Yet today, because of the actions of the House last year, schools all over the United States are in a critical state. They need help, and need help now.

Let me cite one example of the chaos we now have in the public schools, because it is the most urgent example, and because it is typical of what is happening in other critically important areas.

The public schools in Bexar County, Tex., are heavily impacted by the children of Federal employees and military personnel. The policy of the Federal Government has for nearly two decades been to compensate these schools for the cost of educating these children, since it is recognized that the Federal Government pays no taxes to support schools on the land that it occupies. In other words, the Federal Government has been making payments in lieu of taxes in order to support the public services demanded by the presence of Federal facilities.

In Bexar County, Tex., the school districts are virtually all heavily affected by these programs. School districts in three instances draw five-sixths of their operating budgets from these Federal payments authorized by Public Law 874. Other schools draw anywhere from 8 to 13 percent of their budget from this source. Now every one of these schools is in a fiscal crisis. Three of these districts will be forced to close their doors at the end of this month unless help arrives.

This situation developed because last year the House insisted on keeping payments under Public Law 874 at the same level in fiscal 1968 as in the previous year. This would have been enough to pay schools only about 91 percent of what they were entitled to by law. But as it developed, this amount was too small to pay even that. Because new schools had become eligible, and more children were in the program, the money voted by the House would have paid only 86 percent of entitlements. But then came December, and House Joint Resolution 888, which impeached this judgment and invalidated even the inadequate amount voted. The effect of this

resolution was to require the Office of Education not to spend all that had been appropriated for this program. The reduction was something like \$20 million. So, halfway through the fiscal year and more than halfway through the school year, the schools awoke to find their Public Law 874 payments not 100 percent of what they were legally entitled to, not even 90 percent, but only about 81 percent.

Schools must establish their budgets in September, and they must buy supplies and make commitments at that time. But by the time Congress had acted, it was December and schools were irrevocably committed to their 1968 budgets. They were compelled, and are being compelled, to make major reductions in spending when their means of doing so are virtually nonexistent.

Mr. Speaker, three school districts in my districts will close their doors on April 1 unless there is additional money appropriated for the impacted areas program. These are schools which are located on Federal property and which have no tax base whatever. All their students are Federal dependents, and five-sixths of their budgets come from the impacted area program. In this instance, we have the fantastic situation of not being able to operate schools at all.

In other cases, schools in the San Antonio area will be put in the position of educating more federally connected children with less money than they had last year. Yet we know that this is impossible, unless a great amount of quality is taken out of the program. Are we going to reduce schools to caretakers? I hope not, because the role of schools has never been more crucial than it is today, and we can afford less now than we ever could to deny schools adequate tools which are required to accomplish their essential task.

Mr. Speaker, this country is asking men to go abroad at the risk of life and limb, on the promise and hope that they are defending an ideal, and that their country will be grateful. But in this case, we are saying to them that not only their sacrifices, but that of their children as well is being asked. They have no choice but to serve, but we have a choice, and our choice is to either provide their children with adequate schooling or not. I do not believe that we can very well deny that.

I urge my colleagues to vote for supplemental appropriations for the impacted areas program. If this is not done we will be deliberately sacrificing quality education in schools all over the land, and in some cases we will be closing school doors altogether. If we must economize, let us do it on some rational basis. The meat cleaver approach which has created this crisis has spawned many another like it. I do not believe that we can expect anything but irrational results from irrational acts—and it is amply illustrated in the case we have in this program today.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] as they pertain to funds which have heretofore been made available to impacted areas throughout the country.

For instance, in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent, we have heavy military installations and great tracts of land which are used in connection with the operations of these military installations—tracts of land which, of course, have come off the tax rolls. At the same time, we have literally thousands of families who have moved into this area, families who have children who have to be educated. Some of the school districts which are located in these areas of impact cannot formulate their regular much less their ongoing budgets, without the certain knowledge of the continuation of this program. However, suddenly, they are being faced with a 20-percent cutback in these impacted-area funds. This means that in the middle of the year they see that the funds are not going to be available.

For instance, there comes to mind one of my school districts which will suffer a deficit of \$150,000, and in another district they expect a deficit of up to \$350,000, if this Congress does not fully fund this program.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has brought this most pressing problem to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives and I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EVANS] represents a great area, a part of which is occupied by the Air Force Academy and other very important military installations. Further, I recognize the fact that the distinguished gentleman has located in his congressional district certain school districts which have benefited from this program and which have so benefited from it for a couple of decades.

Therefore, it is not true that these school districts budgeted for their school year expenditures last September upon the basis of the commitment and expectation of receiving certain funds from the Federal Government at the Federal level with respect to Public Law 874? Yet, they are now committed in the school year, half of it being now passed.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, the gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct. In order to illustrate to the Members of the House the seriousness of the impact of this problem, the children who are benefited by the provisions of this particular public law have increased in great numbers.

If they are to be taught, great reliance must be placed upon these funds coming in. They have made up their budgets as the gentleman has stated, and they have hired teachers, counting on these funds being available. Now they are faced with a cut of about 20 percent, and now they

have to look to see where in the name of commonsense they are going to get these sums, such as in the one district I mentioned of \$350,000, and in the other district of \$150,000. These areas do not have the capacity in the county or the school districts to make a mill levy that is going to come up with a figure that is capable of meeting the deficits caused by these cuts, not without calling a special session of the legislature, and the legislature already has made its determination of the terms and amounts of State aid to schools, and consequently they face this crisis. The gentleman is absolutely correct when he states that the school districts had every right to count on the Congress fully funding its commitment under Public Law 874.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his comments.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. I thank my colleague for yielding. I also want to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague from Texas on the cutback in funds for Public Law 874 to the impacted areas.

As the gentleman well knows, I have several of these schools in my district, and I am told that these schools are suffering greatly as a result.

I agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas, and with those made by the gentleman from Colorado, on the fact that these school districts were relying on the money that they were told they were going to get, and because of that they made certain commitments, but now in the middle of the school year they are denied the funds they were counting on and cannot fulfill their commitments.

I believe the Department did a great disservice to education in the entire United States when they took the position of cutting these funds in the middle of the year.

I have several school districts in my congressional district that rely almost entirely upon these funds to stay in operation. They have no way of raising any additional local taxes because they too are very poor, and they are now being taxed to the limit. There is one school district in particular in my district which is on a military reservation that has no other way to get money, and is now in danger of closing. They are either going to have to get this money from us up here by some method—and I understand that there will be an amendment coming over from the Senate that will provide at least some relief—or else they will have to close the school and give it back to the Air Force because their entire independent school district is located on Government land, and they have absolutely no power of taxation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Texas for bringing this matter to the attention of the House at this time and, as I said before, I am very pleased to associate myself with his remarks.

Let me assure the gentleman of my very great concern in this area and hope

that we can enlist the help and support of our colleagues to assure the restoration of these funds for federally impacted-area schools.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I will be happy to yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the colloquy that we have been having here by commenting that I hope very much that the House conferees will accept the \$90 million plus that the Senate has suggested putting in the supplemental appropriation which now will go to the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 874 was enacted in 1950 to provide needed assistance to local school districts which provide education to the children of families employed by the Federal Government, both civilian and military.

The funds for each district are determined by a formula written into the legislation. School districts depend upon receiving this money when they make up their annual budgets.

But when Congress enacted Public Law 90-218 last December, imposing mandatory budget cuts on virtually all Federal agencies, it failed to exclude this impacted aid program from these cuts.

The result was a sudden reduction of \$90,965,000 for fiscal 1968 funds. It hit the school districts unexpectedly in the middle of a school year and after they had made up their budgets. The districts had, rightfully, depended upon receiving their full entitlement under the formula. Thus, this funding reduction is not only unfair, but in the case of many districts imposes a burden which is virtually insurmountable for them.

Mr. Speaker, this program of Federal help to the impacted areas is an obligation of the Federal Government, and must be met. The other body has recognized this, and through an amendment has restored this money as part of the urgent supplemental appropriations bill.

In total dollars, the States most severely affected by the cut in Public Law 874 funds are California, Virginia, Texas, New York, Maryland, and Florida. But these funds are distributed to school districts, and districts in all 50 States, plus the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are affected.

Colorado's entitlement under the formula if fully implemented would be \$12,831,708. The mandatory reductions under Public Law 90-218 reduced this to \$10,290,723—a deficit of \$2,540,985 or a 20-percent cut.

The superintendent of El Paso County School District No. 8 which serves the Fort Carson area, has advised me that the reduced funding level for Public Law 874 would saddle his district with a deficit of \$150,000. Eighty percent of this district's schoolchildren are classified as "federally impacted students."

Other examples, equally severe, could be cited from Colorado and other States. In the Third District of Colorado alone, 25 school districts shared \$5,570,937 in fiscal 1967 funds under Public Law 874. This was not "fat" but reflected need, imposed by heavy concentrations of military personnel and their families. These districts, and others like them throughout the United States, depend upon full funding of this program and must have it to avoid serious disruption of their educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the texts of letters which I have received from school officials in Colorado Springs and Fountain, Colo.:

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 8,

EL PASO COUNTY,

Fountain, Colo., February 26, 1968.

HON. FRANK E. EVANS,
Member of Congress,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

SR: The Fountain-Fort Carson Public School System is vitally concerned with the current status of the money appropriated for Public Law 874. Our concern is very "real" because 80% of our student body (over 2300 students) are classified as "federal impact students". Our problem is further magnified due to the fact that the major portion of the property in our school district is classified as federal property. This means we only have approximately \$1700 of assessed evaluation for each pupil enrolled in our school district. Thus, it may be easily determined that each mill levy against our assessed evaluation brings in a very small amount of revenue for our district.

According to the most recent report I have received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Bulletin #25), the money that has been appropriated for Public Law 874 will be pro-rated at 80%. Unless additional funds will be appropriated for Public Law 874, our school district will be in a very serious financial condition. This is true, because an 80% pro-ration will mean an approximate \$150,000 deficit for the coming school year. The \$1,700 assessed evaluation per pupil that our district has (as stated above), means that it is almost impossible for our school district to obtain these funds by increasing our mill levy.

I am very positive that you are aware that our school district (as well as many others in the State of Colorado) must receive 100% financial support from Public Law 874. Therefore, on behalf of our Board of Education, school patrons, student body, and school staff, I sincerely hope you will use your influence to make certain the entire amount needed to supplement Public Law 874 is forthcoming. If you desire more information regarding difficulties we will encounter with the 80% pro-ration, please let me know.

Sincerely,

DEAN FLEISCHAUER,
Superintendent.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,

March 1, 1968.

HON. FRANK E. EVANS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVANS: First, my apologies for the delay in answering your letter of 24 January concerning the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Of prime concern to El Paso County School District #2 is the program which aids federally impacted areas. Because of the close proximity to Fort Carson (and other military installations in the Colorado Springs area) a large percentage of our student population is military connected, thus enabling us to qualify for federal aid under this pro-

gram. The swift and dynamic growth of our district in the past few years is a matter of record. To say that we would have been hard-pressed to meet the needs of such growth without this federal program would be a definite understatement. Within our district it seems we do have "houses with children"; we do not have "industry with tax money". Other than the small shopping area near Stratmoor Hills, our commercial facilities have remained essentially the same for many years—i.e., the Southgate Shopping Center. Also, we have not had an influx of doctors, lawyers, and other professional people "setting up shop" in our area. Overall, with a few exceptions, we can say that the commercial growth in our area has not kept pace with the domestic growth—and our school district is still essentially a residential area. Many of our patrons in the district are eligible to use the facilities at Fort Carson—post exchange, hospital, commissary, etc. Whether there is a correlation between this fact and the small growth in our commercial facilities, I am not qualified to even comment on; however, it is a point to consider.

It is my understanding that the allocation of impacted area funds for our district was cut this year by 20%. If I have stated the case clearly you can see that this could have—and, in fact, did have—an adverse impact upon our school district. Any further reduction of these funds in the ensuing year will seriously hamper us in trying to meet the needs of our ever growing student population.

Your interest in the schools and their problems is most gratifying to me. I would hope that other members of Congress can fully appreciate the unique problems which federally impacted school areas face.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

MRS. ROBERT L. HANSEN,
Member, Board of Education,
El Paso County School District No. 2.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman for their comments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE TRUE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEMS IN SOUTH ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, confronted by the ever-increasing drain on our economic resources and by the steadily mounting toll of lives elicited by our efforts in the war in Vietnam, Americans in positions both prominent and obscure are seeking a reevaluation of our policies in Southeast Asia. We have committed ourselves to contributing toward the resolution of some of the economic and political difficulties plaguing this area of the world, but have we ever truly plumbed the depths of these problems, and are our corrective policies at all attuned to the real nature and magnitude of the dilemmas faced by these Asian nations?

Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, eminent Swedish economist and sociologist, has just completed a 10-year study of South Asia—its people and its problems. There has thus far been no time for detailed eval-

uation of the validity of Dr. Myrdal's analysis and conclusions; however, his discussion of the immensity of the crisis in this area of the world, and his examination of the relative roles to be played by the Asians themselves and by the advanced nations, should give pause to American policymakers as they weigh the value of our military efforts in combating the true ills threatening the Asian nations.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include, for the RECORD, an article appearing in the New York Times of March 11, 1968, by the distinguished and respected New York Times journalist, Peter Kihss, presenting a definitive and concise overview of Mr. Myrdal's study:

MYRDAL FINDS THE OUTLOOK FOR SOUTH ASIA IS GLOOMY

(By Peter Kihss)

In a long, often gloomy study of South Asia and its 748 million people—a fourth of mankind—the Swedish economist Gunnar Myrdal holds that the major need is for changes in attitudes and institutions by the South Asians themselves.

Dr. Myrdal spent 10 years studying 11 nations from India to the Philippines for the 20th Century Fund, which made his report public here. He found the masses apathetic, social and economic inequities extreme, a population growing at unprecedented rates, agriculture underdeveloped despite widespread hunger and manual labor and wage employment held in low regard.

AID A MARGINAL FACTOR

Rather than stressing aid from the West, he called for strong campaigns for birth control by the South Asian governments, quick agricultural improvements through land reform giving incentives to the landless and to sharecroppers and tenants, and an overhaul of an educational system now oriented "for poverty."

"State intervention," Dr. Myrdal held, must overcome development difficulties more formidable than Western nations ever faced. He contended that South Asia needs more Mohandas Gandhis "who would sway the upper classes and would walk the country roads and inspire the people in their villages."

Aid from the West, Dr. Myrdal argued, could be only a marginal factor. But, he added, even marginal aid is crucial to the destitute. He urged more-developed countries to increase the flow of capital and to help even more by preferential buying of South Asian products.

Without basic institutional changes in Southeast Asia, Dr. Myrdal foresaw increasing misery and "explosive potentialities." He downgraded any idea of widespread Communist takeover, but he held that the war in Vietnam was likely to increase Communism and racism in the area and he urged "orderly retreat" by the United States.

Dr. Myrdal's three-volume, 2,284-page study is titled "Asian Drama: An Inquiry Into the Poverty of Nation." The 20th Century Fund is publishing a hard-cover edition in 4,200 copies at \$25 a set, and Pantheon Books is publishing 25,000 paperback copies at \$8.50 a set.

The New York philanthropic foundation has contributed \$250,000 since 1957 to the project, which has also been supported since 1961 by Dr. Myrdal's Institute for International Economic Studies in Stockholm.

Now 69 years old, Dr. Myrdal in 1944 wrote a classic study of Negro-white relations, "An American Dilemma," which contended that Government intervention would be needed to end the conflict between discrimination and American ideals. Before the new study, he served for 10 years as executive secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

STUDY CALLED "DISTURBING"

M. J. Rossant, director of the 20th Century Fund, called the study "blunt, frank and disturbing" and predicted "an important effect on development here and in Asia." The new work was not made available to governments before publication, and informal comment in Washington indicated that in any case the full impact of the study would come over the years.

In a news conference last week at the fund office, 41 East 70th Street, Dr. Myrdal said, "I wanted to be undiplomatic; I'm not afraid of hurting feelings."

"Illusions are a danger, opportunistic illusions are even more dangerous, and truth is wholesome," he added.

"I'm not a defeatist," he insisted, "because I draw the radical conclusions—these things must be done."

The study deals mainly with India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines and to a lesser extent with Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

During the news conference, Dr. Myrdal tried not to emphasize his views on the war in Vietnam. His suggestion of an "orderly withdrawal" by the United States came in response to a question.

In his book, in which he devotes about 20 pages to the war and its background, he wrote that "for many centuries Vietnam defended itself against Chinese encroachment and sought a distinct identity."

"There is no reason," he went on, "to suppose that this tradition would not be kept alive under a Communist regime—unless, of course, people felt that they were the object of a relentless attack from the West."

SEES RACIAL ISSUE

"To the Vietnamese people, a Communist state, intent on preserving a maximum of independence from China, could hardly be a worse alternative than a prolongation of the misery they have suffered these past 20 years."

"Although Westerners, as well as the upper strata in South Asia, generally prefer to ignore it," the report says, "the racial issue is increasingly evident."

"To the people in the villages and the paddyfields, the Americans coming in their helicopters and jet planes to spread fire and death are more than powerful and dangerous strangers: they are 'white devils'—a concept with a long tradition in this part of the world."

Dr. Myrdal contended that "each increase in the war effort has left the situation as bad as it was in the beginning, if not worse."

"The very weakness of the Saigon Government," he wrote, "increases United States dependence on it. Thus the usual disadvantage of having satellites and puppet governments—that the powerful supporting government easily becomes the hostage of its client and dependent on his precarious circumstances—is one more factor in the automatic, accelerating escalation of the war in Vietnam."

URGES POPULATION BRAKE

Surveying the needs of the South Asian region, Dr. Myrdal urged that birth control education be expanded to brake a population upsurge of 2 per cent a year between 1950 and 1960, double the rate of Europe and Asian Russia. Otherwise, he said, South Asia faces a 60 per cent increase in population between 1960 and 1980 to 1.15 billion or 1.25 billion people.

Agriculture, he wrote, is where long-term development in South Asia "will be won or lost." He called for distribution of land to the landless and to renters to give them dignity and new income. He proposed that owners not cultivating farms be subjected to penalty taxes on incomes, and that future land purchases be forbidden to them.

Without any innovations and even without any investment other than longer and

more efficient work, agricultural yields could be raised very substantially Dr. Myrdal said.

South Asia's exports of rice, sugar, cotton and jute have been rising sluggishly for varying reasons, he said, and prospects for tea, tin and rubber are gloomy.

South Asia's imports, he reported, have been soaring—4.3 per cent a year between 1950 and 1960 against a 1.9 per cent annual rise in exports. The region has turned into a net importer of food since World War II.

MARKETS NEEDED

Dr. Myrdal urged that rich countries "initiate effective international action to stabilize their imports of primary products." He proposed that they create markets for South Asian manufactured goods, even by subsidizing imports.

Increasing Western purchases of South Asian manufactured goods, he argued, would be more stimulating than uncertain grants and burdensome loans.

"The employment effects of industrialization cannot be expected to be very large for several decades ahead," he asserted, and they may even first cause a loss of jobs in older manufacturing fields.

The "gap is widening" between "lofty aspirations" and "abysmal reality" in South Asia, Dr. Myrdal wrote. He called all the countries "very poor."

Among a number of special technical studies, one—with considerable warning of error—offered estimates of "average yearly income per head," derived by weighting selected retail prices and agricultural output. This produced estimates for 1954 to 1956 in Indian rupees (then worth 21 cents each) as follows:

Pakistan, 220; India, 260; Indonesia, 300; Burma, 300; South Vietnam, 350; Philippines, 380; Thailand, 400; Ceylon, 460; Malaya, 780.

LACK OF ENFORCEMENT

All the countries, Dr. Myrdal wrote, are "soft states" in which "policies decided on are often not enforced." Changes, he said, will require "putting obligations on people and supporting them by force."

To questioners at his news conference, he commented that the changes could be achieved within a democratic framework. "I am not talking for dictatorships," he said. Even Communist regimes, he added, have carried out "many of these compulsions not by terrorism but by education and getting people involved."

Three-fourths of South Asia's labor force is tied up in agriculture. But Dr. Myrdal's report estimated that the output of agricultural land was "probably only about half as much as China or Europe."

Poor health is "a very serious deterrent" to labor efficiency throughout the region, Dr. Myrdal added.

Except in Ceylon and Malaya, he reported, "the vast majority of children in South Asia either receive no schooling at all or terminate their schooling before they have even approached functional literacy."

As to individual countries, Dr. Myrdal wrote, "India is ruled by a select group of upper-class citizens who use their political power to secure their privileged position."

PAKISTANI REGIME CITED

Hope for progress in Pakistan, he said, "must be attached to the present quasi-dictatorial regime; to its ability, despite its very narrow class basis, to advance national goals of planning, equality and consolidation and to purge the state of corruption."

In Ceylon, he said, parliamentary democracy since the early nineteen-fifties "has operated in an irresponsible and disorderly fashion."

Burma's officer corps, he wrote, looked to the national interest after seizing power in 1962 "without regard to the interests of the upper class of landlords, businessmen and

officials to which they belonged or were closely related."

"Any future government in Indonesia that wants to come to grips with its grave problems will have to be a dictatorship," he said. "The country has experienced a long period of virtual lawlessness, and even to restore a minimum of order will require firm measures."

In Malaya he reported "great economic inequalities between the several ethnic groups and, especially, between the different classes within them."

"It is the almost baronial power wielded by the landed interests," Dr. Myrdal wrote, "that largely explains why, despite its comparative prosperity, the Philippines has experienced so little industrial progress, agrarian reform and democratization of its society in depth."

In Thailand, he said, "concern with the need for internal stability and a strong central government" has provided a convenient justification for the methods by which a ruling oligarchy has maintained an unchallenged hold on the spoils of power."

He found "no fundamental efforts to modernize Cambodia or to arouse its people out of their accustomed torpor," and "no hope of peace and stability in Laos unless there is a settlement of the more bloody struggle in Vietnam."

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the wire services and the newspapers today have been full of interpretive reports on the meaning of the New Hampshire primary yesterday.

I would suggest to the political ghouls they would be well advised not to write any epitaph on President Johnson's political future.

I would not want in any way to minimize Senator McCARTHY's excellent showing in New Hampshire.

But the fact of the matter is that the Senator's name was the only name on the ballot.

President Johnson was not on the ballot, and every single vote he received, he had to receive the hard way—through a write-in.

The President of the United States has had to defend the most difficult war that this country has ever been engaged in. It was against this setting that President Johnson had to rely on write-in votes to sustain his position.

The 2 days of hearings in the other body certainly did not help the President any. One has the right here today to question the motives of those who insisted on prolonging that hearing into the second day in order to dramatize the great debate on the war. I might add, Mr. Speaker, the shameful demonstration against Secretary Rusk clearly demonstrates that the Members of the other body continue to play right into Ho's hands.

I think it is significant that without his name being on the ballot and relying only on write-in votes, President Johnson received 25,716 votes, or 48 percent of the total Democratic vote.

Of course, I have not seen any press reports that emphasize that point. I have not seen a single news story emphasizing that President Johnson's name did not appear on the ballot. They stress the fact that Senator McCARTHY got 41 percent of the votes. Well, I am inclined to think that those who find great significance in that are reporters in New Hampshire who have limited their research to interviews with other reporters.

I do not think it takes a great feat that when you have only one name on a ballot, as you had on the Democratic side in New Hampshire, and that was the name of Senator McCARTHY, to chalk up 30 to 40 percent of the votes.

So those who state that if McCARTHY could have gotten 30 percent of the vote, it was going to be a great victory and that if he got anything over that, it was going to be a runaway, have pulled meaningless figures out of the air. What magic is there in 30 or 40 percent when there is only one name on the ballot?

The important thing I think in the primary is that the two candidates who spoke out most clearly in the defense of this Nation's war policy, men who refused to equivocate or apologize for our effort to save freedom in Vietnam, received together over 100,000 votes.

President Johnson received 25,716 votes—with 97 percent of the ballots counted. Former Vice President Nixon received 81,400 votes.

Conversely, those who have been vacillating on our real purpose in Vietnam trailed substantially behind and received some 33,000 votes for the entire field of doves in both parties.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that perhaps there are some significant facts that we should take into consideration in this discussion about the New Hampshire primary.

First of all, we must remember that the President's name was not on the ballot.

There are those who insisted that the President had a well-organized organization trying to put on a big drive for write-in votes. We learned a long, long time ago that especially with voting machines how really difficult it is to write in a name, no matter how much you support a particular candidate.

So I think the fact that the President received 25,716 votes, or 48 percent of the write-in votes in the New Hampshire primary, without his name being on the ballot, cannot be obscured by the fact that his opponent received 41 percent of the votes, or 21,934 votes, with his own name being the only name on the Democratic ballot.

Perhaps those who are today grooming other candidates to take the President's place at the convention would be well advised to look at recent history.

It should be recalled that the late Estes Kefauver beat President Truman in the 1952 New Hampshire primary, with both names printed on the ballot. In the end, because Mr. Truman did not run for another term, Senator Kefauver had to throw in the sponge in favor of Adlai Stevenson at the Democratic convention.

Henry Cabot Lodge walloped both Barry Goldwater and Nelson Rockefeller

in the 1964 New Hampshire primary, but at the GOP convention in August he received only two votes.

So I say, when you consider a nation of 200 million people, the great issues that stand before us and the President's responsibility to place these issues before the American people, I do not believe we can count Lyndon Johnson out as the next President of the United States on the basis of less than 50,000 votes cast in the Democratic primary in the small State of New Hampshire. I think that perhaps more significant is the quote from the Washington Star editorial this evening which states:

If there is any comfort for those, including ourselves, who believe that the United States must see it through in Vietnam, it will be found in the fact that the combined vote for the President and Nixon, who has been well over on the hawkish side, far exceeded that cast for the dove-like Senator from Minnesota.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. The American people are a wise people. When the chips are down, when Mr. Johnson has presented the full record of his achievements to the American people, and when he has placed in the proper perspective what it is that we are doing in Vietnam—that the war in Vietnam today is perhaps the most important war we have ever fought—that this is indeed the showdown with communism, short of nuclear war—I think that when the history of man's triumph over despotism is written, Lyndon Johnson will be judged by the American people as one of the greatest Presidents of this country and a giant among leaders of this world. Make no mistake, against great adversity and at personal threat to his own popularity and political future, President Johnson has refused to equivocate with the principles of freedom. This will be the real issue when Americans go to the polls all over the United States next November.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the Democratic convention will nominate Mr. Johnson for President, and the American people will reelect him by an overwhelming majority, because this time Lyndon Johnson's name will appear on every ballot in America.

DENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I mailed a questionnaire to every home in my congressional district. The purpose of my sending it was to better understand how my people feel about some of the many issues facing our Nation.

Over 120,000 questionnaires were sent out, and more than 20,000 returned. Because so many were returned, it has taken all this time to compute the results. I am, however, gratified that so many good citizens saw fit to make their views known. In addition, I have received hundreds of letters and notes expanding on the answers given.

The tabulation of results follows; I find it both interesting and enlightening:

	Percent	Percent		
		Yes	No	No opinion
INTERNATIONAL ISSUES				
What policy do you favor for the United States in Vietnam?				
a) Expand the war with additional troops and bombings in an effort to go all out to win.....	49.6			
b) Continue Administration policy of supporting South Vietnam, with limited bombings of the North as a way of achieving a settlement.....	10.0			
c) Restrict our efforts to South Vietnam and attempt to negotiate a settlement.....	6.5			
d) Withdraw our forces from Vietnam.....	8.6			
e) Submit the Vietnam situation to the United Nations for a settlement.....	24.0			
f) No opinion.....	1.3			
What policy do you favor concerning the Middle East situation?				
a) United States political support of Israel.....	12.0			
b) United States political and military support of Israel.....	11.2			
c) United States political support of the Arab States.....	.5			
d) United States political and military support of the Arab States.....	.7			
e) Settlement handled by the United Nations, with the United States remaining neutral.....	74.0			
f) No opinion.....	1.6			
What policy do you favor regarding the Panama Canal?				
a) Continuation of United States control over the Canal.....	47.3			
b) Granting the Republic of Panama complete control over the Canal.....	2.0			
c) Joint operation of the Canal by the U.S. and Panama.....	45.7			
d) No opinion.....	5.0			
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT				
Would you favor establishing a voting age of 18 for all national elections?.....		39.2	57.0	3.8
NATIONAL ISSUES				
What policy do you favor concerning the War on Poverty?				
a) Expand programs and appropriate additional funds.....	23.4			
b) Continue programs as they presently exist.....	24.2			
c) Reduce existing programs and funds allotted for them.....	21.2			
d) Eliminate the War on Poverty.....	23.8			
e) No opinion.....	7.4			
What is your view on the selective service system (draft)?				
a) Retain the present draft system.....	32.9			
b) Use the lottery system, with all young men between the ages of 19 and 26 considered equally eligible.....	34.1			
c) Use the lottery system, pooling all eligible men, but starting with 26 year-olds.....	8.5			
d) Use the lottery system, pooling all eligible men, but starting with 19 year-olds.....	11.6			
e) Using the lottery system, but deferring college students.....	9.4			
f) No opinion.....	3.5			
Which of the following most closely reflects your feelings on federal aid to education?				
a) Federal aid for school construction and supplies, only.....	34.0			
b) Federal aid for teachers' salaries, only.....	9.5			
c) Federal grants to the states to be used as they see fit.....	35.4			
d) No federal aid to education in any form.....	18.9			
e) No opinion.....	2.2			
Do you feel that Congress should help settle labor disputes?.....		41.9	51.4	6.7
Do you favor federal financing of Presidential campaigns?.....		12.4	84.5	3.1
Do you agree with President Johnson's proposal that a 10% surtax be placed on incomes?.....		20.8	71.4	7.8
Due to the increasing cost of a college education, do you feel that parents should be allowed an income tax deduction for their children's college expenses (tuition, room, board, fees, books, etc.)?.....		77.7	19.0	3.3
NATIONAL ISSUES				
Although it will mean an increase in social security taxes, do you support the 12½% increase in social security benefits recently passed by the House?.....		61.5	34.0	4.5
Do you favor celebrating Washington's birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Veterans' Day on Mondays to allow for three-day weekends?.....		58.0	37.3	4.7
Concerning the cost of living and maintaining a home over the past few years, have you found:				
a) that the cost of living has increased in relation to family income?.....	82.9			
b) that the cost of living has remained about the same in relation to family income?.....	12.3			
c) that the cost of living has decreased in relation to family income?.....	2.6			
d) No opinion.....	2.2			
Automobile manufacturers have stated that the federal safety regulations recently imposed have caused the price of new automobiles to increase. In view of this statement, do you favor:				
a) maintaining present safety standards?.....	32.5			
b) establishment of additional safety standards?.....	57.5			
c) eliminating safety requirements in order to reduce the cost of new cars?.....	5.5			
d) No opinion.....	4.5			
One controversial issue facing the Congress is that of meat inspection. As a purchaser of meat, do you find that the quality of meat sold meets with your approval?.....		44.0	49.4	6.6
In general, do you approve of the way President Johnson is doing his job?.....		51.0	40.3	8.7

Mr. Speaker, several points come out clearly on these returns. For example, there is very strong sentiment for doing more to wind up the war in Vietnam. Nearly 60 percent of those responding to the question favor at least a continuation of the administration policy in Vietnam, with 10 percent for the continuation of that policy and 49.6 percent for expanding the war and going all out to win. On the other hand, only 8.6 percent prefer our withdrawal from Vietnam. Surprisingly, 24 percent would like to have the United Nations negotiate a settlement. In any event, this is the one issue in which most of my constituents have an opinion. Fewer responded with a "no opinion" answer to this question than to any of the others.

A really big score for the U.N. came on the Middle East question. Some 74 percent favor U.S. neutrality in the dispute between Israel and the Arab States,

with the U.N. settling the problem. Of those picking sides, Israel overwhelmingly received more support than the Arab States.

The Panama Canal question drew almost equal responses from those for a continuation of U.S. control and those favoring a joint operation of the canal by the United States and Panama. Very few would like the Republic of Panama to have complete control over the canal.

The establishment of a voting age of 18 for all national elections is still an unpopular proposal to the majority of my constituents. Some 57 percent were against it, with nearly 40 percent in favor of it.

The responses to the war on poverty question could hardly have been more equally distributed among four choices. Some 23.4 percent of those responding would like to expand the poverty programs, while slightly more would like to

eliminate them. Also, 24.2 percent favor continuing the programs as they presently exist, and 21.2 percent would like to see them reduced. It could be said, however, that almost one-half of those responding favor at least a continuation along the present lines.

As far as our Selective Service System is concerned, the majority of my constituents are for the lottery system. Although nearly 33 percent are satisfied with the present system of drafting men into the military service, well over half favor some version of the lottery system.

Federal aid to education has become widely accepted, and now the only questions seem to be how and for what the money will be distributed.

A majority are against the Congress helping to settle labor disputes, and a great majority are opposed to Federal systems of financing presidential campaigns.

A tax increase is never a particularly popular proposal, and the President's 10-percent surtax is no exception. Over 71 percent are against the surtax, with a surprising 20.8 percent in favor.

Tax deductions for college expenses and the recent social security increases were both accorded overwhelming endorsements by those responding, while the celebrated 3-day holiday weekend proposal was acceptable, though to a lesser extent.

Nearly 83 percent said the cost of living has increased in relation to family income, while only 12.3 percent felt it had decreased.

A significant majority favor establishing additional automobile safety standards even though it could mean an increase in the cost of cars. Over 32 percent want to at least maintain present safety standards, while only 5.5 percent are for eliminating safety requirements in order to reduce the cost of new cars.

More people are dissatisfied with the quality of meat sold in their markets than are satisfied. One particularly frustrated individual replied that he was perfectly satisfied with the quality of meat, but not especially happy with the way his mother-in-law cooked it.

The last question concerned the way President Johnson is doing his job, and 51 percent approve, while 40.3 percent disapprove. The remainder did not express an opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I have made it a policy to send out questionnaires each year, since I find the results of great assistance to me. Normally, I mail one to each home in my district. This year, however, I decided to also send one to each high school senior in my district, as they will be the voters of tomorrow. The results of nearly 3,000 responses by those seniors to the same questions their parents were asked follow:

	Percent	Yes	No	No opinion
INTERNATIONAL ISSUES				
What policy do you favor for the United States in Vietnam?				
a) Expand the war with additional troops and bombings in an effort to go all out to win.....	47.3			
b) Continue Administration policy of supporting South Vietnam, with limited bombings of the North as a way of achieving a settlement.....	14.8			
c) Restrict our efforts to South Vietnam and attempt to negotiate a settlement.....	10.0			
d) Withdraw our forces from Vietnam.....	8.9			
e) Submit the Vietnam situation to the United Nations for a settlement.....	17.0			
f) No opinion.....	2.0			
What policy do you favor concerning the Middle East situation?				
a) United States political support of Israel.....	8.4			
b) United States political and military support of Israel.....	8.3			
c) United States political support of the Arab States.....	1.4			
d) United States political and military support of the Arab States.....	1.2			
e) Settlement handled by the United Nations, with the United States remaining neutral.....	78.8			
f) No opinion.....	1.9			
What policy do you favor regarding the Panama Canal?				
a) Continuation of United States control over the Canal.....	35.8			
b) Granting the Republic of Panama complete control over the Canal.....	2.3			
c) Joint operation of the Canal by the U.S. and Panama.....	44.0			
d) No opinion.....	17.9			
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT				
Would you favor establishing a voting age of 18 for all national elections?.....		63.1	32.4	4.5
NATIONAL ISSUES				
What is your view on the selective service system (draft)?				
a) Retain the present draft system.....	43.5			
b) Use the lottery system, with all young men between the ages of 19 and 26 considered equally eligible.....	16.7			
c) Use the lottery system, pooling all eligible men, but starting with 26 year-olds.....	10.0			
d) Use the lottery system, pooling all eligible men, but starting with 19 year-olds.....	6.5			
e) Using the lottery system, but deferring college students.....	20.9			
f) No opinion.....	2.4			
Do you feel Congress should help settle labor disputes?.....		52.7	31.9	15.4
Do you favor Federal financing of presidential campaigns.....		11.7	79.5	8.8
Do you agree with President Johnson's proposal that a 10% surtax be placed on incomes?.....		9.6	73.0	17.4
Due to the increasing cost of a college education, do you feel that parents should be allowed an income tax deduction for their children's college expenses (tuition, room, board, fees, books, etc.)?.....		90.0	6.4	3.6
Although it will mean an increase in social security taxes, do you support the 12 1/4% increase in social security benefits recently passed by the House?.....		50.3	29.3	20.4
Do you favor celebrating Washington's birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Veterans' Day on Mondays to allow for three-day weekends?.....		62.5	22.1	15.4
Concerning the cost of living and maintaining a home over the past few years, have you found:				
a) that the cost of living has increased in relation to family income?.....	80.4			
b) that the cost of living has remained about the same in relation to family income?.....	12.3			
c) that the cost of living has decreased in relation to family income?.....	1.5			
d) No opinion.....	5.8			
Automobile manufacturers have stated that the federal safety regulations recently imposed have caused the price of new automobiles to increase. In view of this statement, do you favor:				
a) maintaining present safety standards?.....	36.0			
b) establishment of additional safety standards?.....	51.8			
c) eliminating safety requirements in order to reduce the cost of new cars?.....	3.7			
d) No opinion.....	18.1			
One controversial issue facing the Congress is that of meat inspection. As a purchaser of meat, do you find that the quality of meat sold meets with your approval?.....		53.0	28.9	18.1
In general, do you approve of the way President Johnson is doing his job?.....		44.3	37.7	18.0

With relatively few exceptions, the seniors feel very much like their elders on the issues facing the United States. Their responses on Vietnam and the Middle East are very similar, but they do differ on the Panama Canal question. The seniors generally favor a joint operation of the canal by the United States and Panama, while most of their elders are for a continuation of U.S. control.

On the voting age question, the students had an overwhelmingly affirmative reply of 63.1 percent. Only 32.4 percent felt a national voting age of 18 should not be established.

The war on poverty also elicited a greater favorable response from the seniors, with 50 percent favoring an expansion of poverty programs and only 6.7

percent for an elimination of the war on poverty. The percentages of their elders are 23.4 percent and 23.8 percent, respectively.

The seniors also seem to prefer the present draft system to a greater extent, and support deferments for college students. More of them, however, favor some form of the lottery system, as do their elders.

While a majority of my constituents do not feel the Congress should help settle labor disputes, a majority of the seniors feel Congress should. They are just as opposed to Federal financing of presidential campaigns and the President's surtax proposal, but a greater percentage favor tax deductions for college expenses than do their elders.

The adults responded more favorably to the social security increase than the students, while the latter expressed greater support for the 3-day holiday weekend proposal.

Student views on the cost of living and automobile safety standards closely resemble those of their elders, but they strongly disagree when it comes to the quality of meat sold. The seniors seem perfectly satisfied with that quality, while a majority of their elders are not.

Regarding President Johnson's performance, a majority of the seniors approve of the way he is doing his job. This question, however, seemed to provoke the most varied responses among seniors from the different schools in our area. For example, the seniors at Mones-

sen High School voiced approval of the way President Johnson is doing his job by 53.6 percent to 29.0 percent, while those at Hempfield disapproved 57 percent to 25.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, you can imagine the tremendous workload associated with sending out and tabulating so many questionnaires. But I will say again, that it is well worth the effort. A Member of Congress can only believe he knows how his people feel on certain issues, but when he knows how they feel, it enables him to be a better Representative; and I always want to be the best possible Representative I can be.

AN UNTAPPED SOURCE OF TROOPS FOR VIETNAM

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a searching scrutiny is in progress to find new sources of troops for the war in Vietnam. Draft quotas are up. A callup of reservists is under very careful consideration. U.S. units, held in strategic reserve, have been reduced to the point that we would have a serious problem meeting another threat in another combat theater. The South Vietnamese are adding substantially to their armed forces. Additional troops which have been anticipated from South Korea conceivably will not be made available for the fighting in South Vietnam because of increased action in Korea. Calls for help to other allies are received with averted eyes. There is no response.

Yes, we are spread thin and we are in a war whose demands for trained personnel is never-ending. My attention has been called to one source of military strength which could be extremely helpful, and this information has been imparted to the Department of Defense. The British have in their forces some six divisions of well-trained and highly efficient Gurkhas and Indian troops. It is stated that in the scaledown of British military activity worldwide, there will no longer be a requirement for these forces and nearly all of them will be released. Fighting is all they know. They are trained for nothing else. Americans who have fought alongside them say they are outstanding in performance. These troops require little supplies and their percentage of support forces is extremely small compared to ours. Here is a possible source of valuable fighting men who are ready for combat.

It is my recollection that the United States has on the statute books legal authority for employing personnel of other nations. If, however, there should be a legal stumbling block, there should be no problem in having the Australians or the New Zealanders step into the picture and to arrange for the utilization of these forces. I urge that immediate steps be taken to explore to the fullest the possibilities of obtaining the services of these excellent troops.

OUR MOST FANTASTIC FLYING MACHINE

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the F-111 supersonic airplane—formerly the TFX—will emerge from the welter of controversy and criticism which has surrounded it and become recognized for what it is, a fantastic machine of the greatest sophistication.

I have seen this aircraft and I believe it will surprise its critics and reassure its supporters.

The March 1968 issue of Nation's Business has an excellent article on the F-111. This is "must" reading for all who are concerned with national security.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the article follows:

READY FOR ANY WAR—OUR MOST FANTASTIC FLYING MACHINE

(NOTE.—Associate Editor Robert W. Ireland wrote this article after talking to the pilots who fly the F-111, mechanics who maintain it and men in companies that build it.)

What kind of bird can fly in any weather, hang in the sky or surge to supersonic speed, soar across any ocean, climb into thin air or skim the ground with unerring calm, stop on a dime and carry on its back a crew of humans in shirt-sleeve comfort?

This bird is man-made. It's the F-111 (formerly the TFX), probably the most fantastic flying machine American ingenuity has ever conceived. Certainly it is the most sophisticated and the most controversial airplane that industry has turned out.

As it converts contractual promises to proven capabilities, it's showing it can do more things well than any other warplane.

All this is a tribute to the men and companies who've built the plane and its amazing components in the midst of a political whirlpool. And it's a tribute to the military men who are flying it day and night to make themselves and the plane combat ready.

The conclusion that the F-111 is an amazingly versatile, highly effective weapons system and not the "Flying Edsel" some of its detractors contend, comes after dozens of interviews with the brass who command it, the combat veterans who fly it and the mechanics who maintain it. A Nation's Business editor went to Ft. Worth, Texas, where prime contractor General Dynamics Corp. is assembling the plane; to Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, where crews are getting to know it; to the Pentagon, and to Capitol Hill.

"We have nothing but good news; this plane is an unprecedented success," says Air Force Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, whose job is to be critical. As commander of the Tactical Fighter Weapons Center at Nellis Air Force Base, a few miles northeast of Las Vegas, he's responsible for the quality of the equipment and the crews.

Every pilot who'll fly the F-111A, the version assigned to the Tactical Air Command, will be checked out at Nellis.

"We need a bird like this in Viet Nam," comments Maj. Kenneth Blank, a crew-cut Nebraskan who flew combat in Korea and, during one of his 100 missions in Viet Nam, became the first F-105 pilot to down a Russian-built MIG.

"It gives us an all-weather, day or night aircraft; it can fly when nothing else can get up."

Interrupted while scrutinizing radar pictures, Korea combat veteran Lt. Col. Ed Palmgren agrees: "It flies like a Cadillac. It's a darn fine plane—a very fine low-altitude penetrator."

FIRST OF ITS KIND

What's so special about the F-111? Mostly it's the many things it can do well. It has stretched the art of aircraft building dramatically.

It is the first operational U.S. aircraft with variable-sweep wings that allow the pilot to shape his plane for the job he wants it to do. By moving a lever in the cockpit, he can extend the wings almost at right angles to the fuselage, giving him maximum lift for takeoff from short airfields and allowing landings at about 100 miles per hour. With the wings fully extended, the F-111 can loll in the skies for hours or fly nonstop and without aerial refueling to most overseas bases.

Then, to attain high- or low-level supersonic speeds, the pilot can sweep the wings back against the fuselage. Previous swing-wing planes, which never reached the operational stage, caused balance problems. By contrast, the F-111, as Maj. Ken Blank puts it, "feels the same" in all configurations.

Other jet fighter planes pop out a drag chute when landing to slow them down; if the chute fails, there's a chance of overshooting the runway. The F-111 doesn't have or need a drag chute. With wings extended, "it feels almost like a glider coming in," the pilots say, stopping in less than 2,000 feet if it has to.

Within these versatile wings, wherever mechanical complexity will allow, is fuel storage to stretch the warplane's range.

A revolutionary new way to protect the plane's crew against drastic environmental changes had to be devised. The F-111 can do better than 1,650 miles an hour at altitudes of more than 60,000 feet and can dash through the denser air just above treetops at speeds of more than 900 miles an hour.

This job went to McDonnell Douglas Corp., the St. Louis-based maker of the highly-effective F-4 fighter plane and the Mercury and Gemini spacecraft.

A pilot couldn't eject from an F-111 unprotected; he simply couldn't survive the blast of air. So, McDonnell Douglas made his cockpit into a survival capsule. By pulling a pistol-grip release stick next to his seat, the pilot sets off an explosion that guillotines the crew module from the fuselage. A rocket motor propels the capsule clear of the plane. This ejection system can be used at every speed and every altitude. All the time, the pilot and copilot are kept at shirt-sleeve comfort in their pressurized cabin.

In an emergency, if the fliers need to evacuate the plane on the runway, the rocket fires their capsule up and behind the plane, nearly 500 feet into the air. Chutes open, landing pads inflate and the module lands as gently as a paratrooper. When the module is ejected, it takes a small part of the wings with it for stability.

Should the plane be forced down at sea, the module automatically rises to the surface and rights itself. It's watertight, but if a leak occurs, both the pilot's and copilot's control sticks can be used as bilge pumps. Pumping them in the opposite direction keeps the capsule's flotation bags inflated.

The capsule has survival and protection equipment, too. If the two-man crew is descending in friendly territory it can expel metallic chaff on the way down to make radar detection easier.

The capsule ejection has been tested, and it works. On one test run, pilots had to desert a research and development-model F-111. The only physical damage to the crew was a nicked thumb one pilot got climbing through a barbed wire fence after the safe landing.

Pilots rave about the craft's avionics (short for aviation electronics). "It's fan-

tastic," says pipe-smoking Air Force Capt. Joe Keene, who flew F-4's in Viet Nam combat.

Perhaps the most revolutionary of the avionics subsystems is the F-111's terrain-following radar (TFR), supplied by Texas Instruments, Inc. This allows the pilots automatically to hug the terrain's profile at supersonic speeds and below the enemy radar's eye-level.

"The TFR's tremendous. You don't need anything but self-control," maintains Lt. Colonel Palmgren. He's referring to the natural instinct to pull the plane up as it nears a radio tower or hillside. But the system, itself, does that.

General Taylor recalls his first flight more than a year ago using the TFR: "We headed straight for this mountain. The first two passes I wouldn't let the system do it; then the third time I did, and she climbed right over."

IDEAL FOR FAR EAST

The F-111's TFR will have special advantages in hilly countries of the Far East, Maj. Ken Blank contends. "Up to now in Viet Nam, we haven't been able to let down as much as we wanted because of the sharp peaks and valleys. Now we'll be able to do it."

The TFR constantly looks down, ahead and to each side. Signals are sent to the autopilot for automatic flight, or displayed on a cockpit instrument for manual flight. And should any of the TFR's circuits fail, the system automatically sends the aircraft into a sharp climb to a higher, safer altitude.

Another part of the plane's avionics, its flight control system, is, to use Pentagonese, self-adaptive. This means that electronic sensors and computers measure the aircraft's motions and compensate for any deviations with direct commands to the controls.

For example, if atmospheric conditions suddenly change as with strong gusts of wind, the system automatically makes adjustments for pitch, roll or yaw—even before the pilot senses they're needed.

The flight control system, developed by General Electric Co., is "triply redundant." Three separate electronic circuits work simultaneously, and if any one fails, it is automatically ignored while the others carry on.

Look at some of the other guidance systems. Using his radar and on-board computers, the pilot knows his position precisely. Specifications allow two miles of error for two hours of flight, says George Davis, a former test pilot and General Dynamics' top man working with Air Force crews at Nellis. "We've been performing at one-half that error," he notes.

The system supplies data for automatic radar bombing. It also allows the F-111 to make instrument landings on any runway, even those not equipped with radio or radar landing aids.

An attack radar gives a clear picture of ground or airborne targets, regardless of visibility, and at the same time tells the changing range between the plane and target, corrects any navigational errors and does radar photography.

Finally, a computing sight and a missile-launch computer enable the two-man crew to fire guns and missiles accurately by using data shown on the instrument panel.

Perhaps overstating the qualities to make his point, Ken Blank says "the avionics are 1,000 per cent better than I'm used to."

"The radar systems are better than we thought they'd be," comments Col. Ivan H. Dethman, raising his voice to offset the loud window-rattling caused by a departing jet. "We have done everything with this plane it was supposed to do," says the man who commands the 428th Tactical Fighter Squadron, the first operational unit to get the

F-111A. "This is and will be an excellent fighter-bomber," the Colonel maintains.

SENATOR CANNON'S PRAISE

"With these electronics, you can drop a bomb in a pickle barrel," Sen. Howard W. Cannon (D., Nevada) tells Nation's Business. He ought to know. As a Major General in the Air Force Reserves, Senator Cannon has flown just about every kind of combat plane in the U.S. inventory and last October became the first nonactive duty pilot to fly the F-111A.

The Senator, whose office is adorned with a "Mach 2" certificate and droves of scale models of the military aircraft he's flown, has no axe to grind. None of the contractors for the F-111 is in his state, and Nellis Air Force Base would be in Nevada whether or not the plane was. But he grows impatient with some of the plane's critics in Washington. "To find out if this is a good or bad plane," he says, "talk to the people who fly it and the people who maintain it."

The F-111 also marks a breakthrough in jet engine technology. It's the first to mate a turbofan engine, for fuel economy for long-range subsonic flight, with an afterburner, for added thrust for takeoff and supersonic flight.

The afterburner, unlike its predecessors, gives the pilot a choice of five settings. Previously, when a pilot went to afterburner, he went "all out." He got maximum thrust but also burned tremendous amounts of fuel. The F-111's afterburner gives the pilot a choice of thrust.

Each F-111 is powered by two of these TF-30 engines built by United Aircraft Corp's Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division. There have been bothersome problems mating the engines and the air inlets on the plane, but both contractors and pilots agree they've been solved.

EASY TO MAINTAIN

Reliability and maintainability were designed into the F-111. They had to be; the Air Force and Navy set the most stringent requirements ever for a combat aircraft. Among other things, each F-111 must start to taxi for take off within five minutes after an alert; must be able to take off within 30 minutes after returning from a previous mission; and must require no more than 15 minutes for identifying any fault.

In calling the plane "an unprecedented success," General Taylor says he is measuring it two ways: First, utilization. "We are averaging 58-to-60 hours per aircraft per month flying time, twice what we get with other aircraft."

As for the second measurement, maintenance, the General, who wears combat and service ribbons about three inches deep on his chest, notes: "We couldn't have had any real problems and be where we are with this plane."

The plane is designed to require minimum maintenance man-hours per flying hour.

Maintenance is Maj. Bob Autry's business. The genial Alabamian is maintenance officer for the F-111 squadron at Nellis. Sipping coffee, he says: "I've worked F-100's, F-86's, and you can't beat this bird. We're real happy with it."

Faced with stringent reliability and maintainability requirements, General Dynamics and its subcontractors made the F-111 the most accessible aircraft for servicing yet built. They did away with most of the ground support equipment by building self-testers into as many components as they could. By flipping a dial past various numbered settings, a maintenance man can pinpoint a problem or determine if the unit is A-okay.

If it's defective, he loosens a couple of screws, slides the component out and slips in a fresh one.

Ninety-five per cent of the plane's parts can be removed without first removing an-

other part, and most of the servicing can be done at shoulder height.

Master Sgt. Charles B. Hennessee, who has spent 23 years in flight-line maintenance and now is line chief for the first detachment of the first F-111 squadron, puts it this way: "There's no comparing this with any other plane in maintenance accessibility. You don't have to rip half the plane apart to get at something."

The burly sergeant walks around a parked F-111 and continues his praise: "I brought the F-4 (considered our best combat plane in Viet Nam) into the Air Force inventory, and we've had fewer problems with this plane than that."

He points to the plane's tires. "Normally, we get 30 landings on a set of fighter plane tires, if we're fortunate. This plane has 85, and we've got another 25, I guess." The maintenance men will know when it's time to change the tire because red cord will begin to show.

To point up the ease of maintenance, Bob Autry adds: "I've got Airmen First Class doing what it used to take Master Sergeants to do."

AWESOME ARMORY

You crouch down under the nose landing gear to see where the 20-millimeter Gatling gun is housed; it can fire 6,000 rounds a minute and the canister for just 2,000 rounds looks like an 80-gallon hotwater heater.

The F-111 can carry nearly all known or planned nuclear or nonnuclear weapons from bombs to rockets. All versions of the plane have an internal weapons bay, but they also can hang tons of destruction on wing pylons. On the tactical fighter and strategic bomber versions of the F-111, for example, there can be eight pylons.

The F-111 is one of the few fighter-type planes with side-by-side seating; most are one behind the other. Such seating allows a shorter cockpit, less duplication of controls, more coordination with the other crew member and, as one pilot puts it, "four eyes looking out front instead of two."

Colonel Al Esposito, assistant for the F-111 system program at the Pentagon, emphasizes the plane's ability to fly very low at very high speeds. A MIG-21, the Soviet Union's most modern combat plane, would tear its wings off if it tried to chase an F-111 supersonically for long at low levels, where the air is thick.

The Colonel mentions, but won't elaborate on, the craft's secret electronic countermeasures that can be used to confuse the enemy.

The configuration of the plane has, wherever possible, been shaped to deflect radar beams rather than bounce them back. Complementing this design is the use of a paint that absorbs rather than reflects radar, so that the enemy gets back a dimmer "blip" than normal.

As with other jet combat planes, the F-111 has a valve in the tail section that's normally used to dump fuel to make a lighter landing. But F-111 pilots can dump small amounts of fuel at a time, turn them into balls of fire by igniting them with their afterburners and thus confuse heat-seeking enemy missiles.

Beyond that, technicians say, the exhaust of the F-111's engines is cooler than that of many other warplanes, making it harder for missiles to zero in.

Current planning estimates are for more than 1,200 F-111's, in various versions, to be built. More than 40 are in stages of completion along General Dynamics' nearly mile-long assembly line in Ft. Worth.

There engines move down one line, fuselages down another, with tape-operated cutting machines forming whole sections. Sneaker-clad workmen climb from craft to craft. Parts move above them on a monorail.

Aft fuselage sections and landing gear are supplied by the principal subcontractor,

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., of Bethpage, N.Y.

The 26,000 workers at the Ft. Worth plant turn out about 10 planes a month. The target for peak production of 28 planes a month is early 1970.

The budget President Johnson sent Congress for the coming fiscal year asks \$1.1 billion for 163 F-111A and F-111D planes for the Air Force; the 111D will have an even more sophisticated and effective avionics package being developed by North American Rockwell Corp. It will enhance the plane's ability to do air-to-air battle.

President Johnson also wants \$550 million for 75 FB-111's which would be used by the Strategic Air Command as it phases out older versions of the workhorse B-52's. And he asked \$350 million for 30 F-111B's, the Navy version.

Other versions of the F-111 are the RF-111A, a reconnaissance craft that will stuff its weapons bay with photographic equipment and sensors, and the F-111C being built for the Royal Australian Air Force. The British, in an economy move, have canceled their order for 50 F-111's.

NAVY CRITICS

Elements in the Navy argue for a smaller, lighter craft than the F-111.

Most of the controversy over the F-111, which started years ago with the prime contract award, has centered around the Navy version, the 111B, that would carry the deadly Phoenix missile system built by Hughes Aircraft Co.

General Dynamics, after working quietly with its 19 major subcontractors and nearly 12,000 suppliers for five years, is now beginning to reply to some of the critics. Frank W. Davis, president of General Dynamics' Ft. Worth Division and a former test pilot, tells NATION'S BUSINESS:

"If we compare the F-111 with the best fighter-bomber in service today, we find it provides twice the range, with twice the payload, is 20 percent faster, is 50 percent shorter on takeoff and landings, and provides eight times better navigation system.

"As compared to the next best fleet air defense system, it provides twice the loiter (circle in place) with one and one half times the missiles. The missiles have three times the range. It provides six times as many kills per salvo. It will operate from 500 miles greater distance with the same bomb load, and its approach speed for carrier landings is 15 to 20 knots slower."

THE COURAGE OF RUMANIA

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, interesting developments are taking place in Eastern Europe. Significant changes seem to be occurring in Czechoslovakia and Rumania in particular. It is quite possible that recent events, largely unnoticed by the American public, may be a prelude to convulsions which will command world attention.

Soviet Marxism is a dated doctrine. In Eastern Europe, it is also a decaying doctrine with shallow roots. We should bear in mind the fact that communism came to Eastern Europe not because of any intrinsic merit or political appeal but on the strength of Soviet military power.

The Communist governments there

have always represented a minority of the population. Their allegiance to Russia and reliance on Russian arms have inevitably weakened their hold on the people. National feelings and traditions periodically bubble to the surface and the imported foreign doctrine must either adjust or perhaps be swept away.

The nations of Eastern Europe are different, one from the other, despite the Communist facade they have in common. Their politics are really quite a great deal more complex than routine anti-Communist pamphleteers suggest. In another vein, the "thaw" which we periodically observe has been neither permanent nor irreversible.

Poland, which seemed to be moving in the direction of liberalization in 1956, has frozen up again. Czechoslovakia which seemed frozen, has at long last begun to rumble.

Anatole Shub, of the Washington Post foreign bureau, has for two decades been one of the most perceptive observers of the Eastern European and Russian scene. If my memory is correct, Mr. Shub wrote some penetrating pieces about Hungary and Poland in Reporter magazine in the mid-1950's, giving a new dimension to the rather wooden, monolithic image we had of those nations. And this was prior to the dramatic events of 1956.

Last weekend, Mr. Shub capped his stories about the Communist Party conclave in Budapest with a piece about the dramatic walkout by Rumania. The article, from the March 2 issue of the Washington Post, follows:

EVEN THE YUGOSLAVS WERE AWED BY RUMANIA'S COURAGE

(By Anatole Shub)

BUDAPEST, March 1.—On the day that comes only once in four years, the odd men out were the heroes.

February 29, the day Pope Gregory the Great put in the calendar to even Julius Caesar's calculations, may well become another Rumanian national holiday. But there will have to be titanic changes before it will be remembered calmly, let alone celebrated, in the Kremlin—just as it took the revolution to switch Russia from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar.

The great day that Rumania challenged, defied and finally walked out on the 65-nation international Communist "consultative meeting" was electrifying, not only for the delegates assembled in the Hotel Gellert but also for the more than 200 newsmen gathered in a press center three miles away. At day's end, the half-dozen Rumanian newsmen, who have been racing the news from their delegation to their colleagues, were nine feet tall and glowing with pride.

Even the Yugoslavs, a star array of journalistic wits imbued with two decades of skepticism toward the "international workers movement," were awed by the Rumanian performance. They had long valued their Balkan neighbors' skill at intricate diplomatic maneuver, but were visibly moved by a toughness and courage which would have done credit even to the ever-defiant mountaineers of Montenegro.

The Russians, as they have been throughout the conference, were remote, inaccessible, silent. East Germans were angry, Poles and Italians disturbed, Hungarians depressed. The Czechs, just starting down the road the Yugoslavs and Rumanians have traveled, said little but smiled quietly.

Nobody pretended to know what the future might bring, but all knew it was a historic moment, that a page had been

turned, just as it had been when Stalin excommunicated Yugoslavia's Tito in June, 1948, and when Chou En-lai walked out of Khrushchev's 22d party congress in November, 1961.

The great day galvanized an otherwise torpid meeting which, until the Rumanians struck, had largely been generating not high drama but a kind of black humor.

To begin with, the meeting at the Gellert, like last year's European Communist conference at Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia, was being held at a place famous for the curative powers of its thermal waters.

Various opinions were advanced as to what conditions of the "movement" these baths were designed to cure. And some wits were suggesting that the next big conference held at Vrnacka Banja, a most "proletarian" spa in Serbia famous for its thick mud.

With most of the delegates residing at the Gellert, and the sessions running to midnight and beyond, some wondered whether to call the parley a "sleep in" or a "swim-in." When the conference spent the first day and a half debating what to do about the press, newsmen wondered if perhaps they should take on the task of unifying the Communist movement.

In the end, an official communique was put out every night, obviously edited by the side that had wanted no publicity at all and normally appearing at 2 a.m.

But delegations were free to publicize their own viewpoints, and the Rumanians took over with a vengeance—supply texts of Scintella editorials in four languages, briefing newsmen at Budapest restaurants until 4 a.m., providing in bound pamphlet form the brilliant opening address of their delegate, Paul Niculescu-Mizil, and finally announcing: "We're packing our bags."

The Niculescu-Mizil speech may well become a collectors' item. One independent Marxist here called it "the most lucid, intelligent Communist document since Mao Tse-tung let the hundred flowers bloom."

There was nothing comparable on the other side, that of the Soviets and their big battalions—except perhaps for the super-dogmatic speech of East Germany's Erich Honecker, which seemed more of archeological than of historic interest. All it lacked for complete authentication was the closing cry, "Long live the great Stalin, genius of all humanity!"

TWO INTERPRETATIONS

As for the substance of the conference, there were all sorts of theories and analogies. A Western bystander compared the struggle to the schisms in the Christian church:

"The Russians want a single Catholic church, with the curia in Moscow. The Rumanians are for orthodoxy, with everyone having his own autocephalous church and the patriarchs kissing once a year. The Yugoslavs started protestantism, like Luther, and the Chinese took it all the way, like Calvin. Now what we're seeing here is the counter-Reformation with Mikhail Suslov as Ignatius Loyola. Couldn't you see him painted by El Greco?"

And a Yugoslav observer provided the most caustic interpretation of all:

"What is the world Communist movement they are all talking about? There is no such thing. You cannot have a world movement without a center, just as you cannot have an army without a headquarters or a general.

"There are just a lot of different parties calling themselves Communist. There are the parties in power, some of them by consent, some by force. There are a few parties out of power which really amount to something, which have members and voters. And then, by the dozens, there are the parties with a name and address but no members and no prospects.

"It is ridiculous to talk about a unified world movement when what you have is a state of anarchy in which everybody does

what he pleases. As to this meeting, it is like a great big salad into which numerous vegetables are tossed. First there is the Soviet party line, then the Rumanian line, the Italian line, and Lord knows what else. By the time you've eaten the salad, how do you know where the Marxism was?"

NO MAGIC IN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we heard so much reference made in the recent television hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to the subject of peace negotiations with Hanoi, that I believe we ought to be well aware that there is no special magic in negotiations themselves, apart from the specific results which those negotiations can bring toward a stable and lasting peace.

Recently, this point was brought out with particular clarity in a leading editorial which appeared in the Auburn Citizen Advertiser of Auburn, N.Y., for March 11, 1968.

Under unanimous consent I include this thoughtful editorial so as to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

NO MAGIC IN NEGOTIATIONS; WAR WILL BE WON OR LOST

There are some among the "doves" who are ready to have this country accept outright defeat as the price for ending the war. But most of those who severely criticize American policy in Southeast Asia would not admit to any such point of view. They demand cessation of the bombing and then "negotiations" in the apparent belief that there is some sort of magic in negotiations and that once they are underway, a peace formula can somehow be worked out.

There is nothing to support this thesis; it is an exercise in wishful thinking. It is impossible to believe that there can be any such thing as a neutral solution. One side will win, the other lose; one will succeed and the other fail.

Therein lies the snag for the peacemakers, including U Thant and Prime Minister Wilson and everybody else who just wants the war to stop. They would like to find a solution for ending the bloodshed that would not require either side to admit defeat. There is no such answer.

The two chief protagonists, President Johnson and Ho Chi Minh, know that the crucial issue is who will dominate the Saigon government after the war—the Communists or the non-Communists. It will be one or the other.

An entirely logical dove argument is that victory in South Vietnam is not worth what it will cost us and, hence, that we should get out—quickly or gradually—saving as much face as we can. That is Stokely Carmichael's point of view and essentially that of Senator McCarthy. Whether right or wrong, it is a perfectly relevant point of view.

What is not logical, but an illusion, is the idea that negotiations are somehow an end in themselves and are certain to lead to a settlement acceptable to both sides.

OPEN LETTER TO HO CHI MINH

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, reference is often made here in this House and even more frequently perhaps over in the U.S. Senate, as to the thinking of the American people, the so-called "man in the street," on the basic issues in the Vietnam war.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer for the consideration of my colleagues in both Houses of the Congress the following eloquent and persuasive article by Mr. John Hough, an editor of the Oneonta Daily Star of Oneonta, N.Y., in the form of an open letter to Ho Chi Minh. In my judgment Mr. Hough's letter does a magnificent job of reflecting the sentiments of a majority of the people of my upstate New York district.

The article, dated March 4, 1968, follows:

OPEN LETTER TO HO CHI MINH (By John Hough)

Mr. HO CHI MINH,
Hanoi, North Vietnam.

DEAR SIR: Are you still of the belief that North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops can out-last U.S. fighting men until the United States quits in South Vietnam?

If you are, Boy, are you wrong.

If you are a sincere patriot with the well being of the North Vietnamese people at heart the best thing to do is back out as gracefully as possible.

Because the people in the United States are getting just a little sick of you; of North Vietnamese intervention in the south, and the whole operation.

And, contrary to what your information sources may have told you, when the U.S. public gets sick of something they don't back off and quit. No, they dig in and clean up the problem.

All it takes is a catalyst.

And the catalyst to make the U.S. public good and angry; angry enough to blot North Vietnam right off the map, could be 5,000 men trapped in a pocket with 50,000 of your men ringing them in.

What you maybe don't realize is that the war in Vietnam, while major consequence to you, hasn't dented our finances enough yet to pry loose support for a tax increase.

This is a land of 200,000,000 people of which a major portion is reveling in prosperity. The war has hurt, there's no denying that. There are grieving families all over the nation who have lost a loved one in Vietnam.

But there are no ration coupons; no lines waiting for items in short supply; no major trouble with the availability of steel or critical materials.

In other words the U.S. has up to date, been able to carry on the war and business—as usual—at home at the same time. If the word filtering out of North Vietnam is right, Mr. Ho Chi Minh, that hasn't been the case with you even with massive help from Russia and Red China.

You also seem to be laboring under a misunderstanding that a major number of U.S. citizens are opposed to the war in Vietnam and want the U.S. to pull out.

Wrong again. Lots of people don't like the war but the proportion who want the U.S. to pull out is a whole lot smaller than the noise they make. In fact the group is probably just about the same size as the less vocal group who would like to see Hanoi, Haiphong and other North Vietnamese cities leveled to the ground.

So, Mr. North Vietnamese leader, you just keep on pushing. Sooner or later somebody in the "Mr. Big" class in the U.S.A. will decide that we are wasting time, men, money and world stature by fighting the war on your terms.

Somebody will decide your rat's nest in North Vietnam needs some housecleaning.

And the U.S. is just the party who can do it.

THE POSTAL SERVICE FINDS AN ELOQUENT CHAMPION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to invite the attention of the House to the fact that the postal service has found an eloquent champion in Miss Joan Beebe of Olean, N.Y. Miss Beebe is a secretary and she recently wrote the Olean, N.Y. Times Herald to express her admiration for the fine job the post office does day after day. Miss Beebe contends that the postal service, which every American has at his command for just 6 cents constitutes an outstanding bargain. I believe Miss Beebe's point is well taken and I insert her letter in the RECORD:

[From the Olean (N.Y.) Times Herald,
Feb. 26, 1968]

IN DEFENSE OF U.S. POST OFFICE TO THE EDITOR, TIMES HERALD.

I can't stand it any longer. I have to sit down and write a letter in defense of the United States Post Office. I am a secretary and as such am continually writing letters and receiving replies (in addition to my own personal correspondence) to same and have never had any complaints about mail service. Where else for six cents can you find out all about your friends and relations, make reservations, be cheered by cards on your birthday or when you're in the hospital, conduct business, etc., at any point in the United States, Canada, Hawaii and Alaska; not even mentioning foreign countries which, of course, costs more?

As a prime example, my sister in Rochester asked me to try and get her six tickets for the St. Bonaventure-Providence basketball game. I obtained the tickets, mailed them to her on a Thursday morning before 8:00 a.m. and on the following Saturday morning I received a note from her thanking me for the tickets and enclosing a check for them.

I for one have never ceased to be amazed at this fantastic service our government practically gives to us. No wonder they are always operating in the red!! I'd be willing to bet my bottom dollar that the poor deliveries cited in "Generally Speaking" are few and far between percentage-wise. In conclusion, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank Mr. O'Brien.

(Miss) JOAN BEEBE.

THE BUDGET IS A BOOST FOR STATISM

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message came as a shock to those of us who had hopefully expected a serious effort to limit domestic spending to the bare essentials if only to clear the way for whatever defense appropriations may be required without another shameful rise in the national debt.

The budget request is a keen disappointment. We can no longer afford to permit Government the luxury of spending above its income, and wage earners cannot be burdened with a tax increase that is unjustifiable.

But fiscal considerations alone are not what makes the proposed budget so revolting. It is also repugnant because of the very philosophy it espouses, for it would accelerate the trend toward dependence on Government and discourage in individuals the initiative, the industry, the ambition, and the free will that with God's help established America as the mightiest of all nations.

The Federal Government should promote self-sufficiency, not destroy it. Rather than build attractive avenues of access to a subsidized subsistence, the Federal Government should show the way to personal independence and its ultimate reward even though the course may appear difficult and challenging. In essence, the Federal Government should present Government welfare as a temporary expediency, not glorify it as a permanent institution.

The budget reflects defeat. It implies that more people will need more help, more services, more direction, more supervision. And all the while they must become more submissive to the Federal Government.

The budget is a scenario in which the failure is hero. The supporting cast is made up of taxpayers, but otherwise they are of no importance. They have been upstaged by bureaucratic producers.

What about our men and our women who must underwrite this farce? Not a few of them remember when the necessities of life were hard to come by, and even in today's so-called economic paradise many of them are living in less than ease and comfort despite a full workweek and whatever overtime they can muster. They may not fully understand the blessings of record gross product and record gross income because of the gross extravagance of the bureaucratic progenitors of these catchy phrases is taxing them out of so much of their wages and sending prices sky high through the medium of Government-created inflation.

The working public is not unsympathetic to deserted children, home-locked mothers, unemployable elderly, or to men who cannot find work. From the time of the great depression Federal and State assistance was needed by countless strong and willing heads of households unable to obtain employment.

But relief was a stopgap recourse, not a way of life to be cherished to eternity.

The "Book of Johnson"—fiscal 1968-69—is an open invitation to permanent status on public welfare. It further provides for an evergrowing number of other persons to partake in assorted

bureaucratic favors to be dispensed by an evergrowing roster of Government workers with evergrowing authority. It is in effect a repudiation of the principle and tradition that Government serve as the creature and instrument of the sovereign people; rather, it is a blueprint for fixing Government subventions in perpetuity, for continued Federal encroachment upon individual and community rights, and for increased assessments upon those who would succeed by toil, devotion to duty, and sacrifice.

Congress must not accept the plan. We cannot permit failure and apathy to be rewarded at the expense of labor and enterprise. When I first became a candidate for the House of Representatives 18 years ago, I pledged to oppose paternalistic and totalitarian schemes to the limit of my ability. A campaign speech included this admonition:

Americans, having engaged in a titanic struggle for freedom 175 years ago, now find themselves in a second struggle to preserve that freedom.

The second struggle for freedom is upon us and it will not be easily won. The opening skirmishes began a dozen years ago and we are today suffering because of the socialist planners' victories. Let's pause for a moment and see how far we have gone down the road toward a socialized state. Let's see if we can't agree on ways of measuring the inroads that have already been made on our freedom.

It has always been a fundamental political doctrine that the limit of the power of government is the extent that government controls your purse. History contains thousands of examples of liberty-loving people rising up against abuse of the power to tax. Our own country came into existence because the founding fathers opposed taxation over which they had lost control. They realized that the more the state placed you in financial bondage the less you have for yourself and the more control it has over you. . . .

Now let us examine what is happening to our freedom directly as a result of the power to tax. The advocates of the socialized state have a simple but insidious scheme and they are putting it into operation increasingly in this country. The scheme calls for them to tax you and then give you part of your money back in the form of government checks for this and government checks for that. What we are really doing today is sending our money down to Washington and letting the bureaucrats handle it for us. Naturally they would like to handle more of your money and my money because the more they handle of your money and my money the more powerful becomes their control over us. . . .

At that time—in 1949—the Federal budget amounted to \$39.4 billion as compared with the 1969 estimate of more than \$147.4 billion. Even more fearful is the number of today's Federal employees—2.9 million—a rise of 800,000 from the total payroll 18 years ago.

My promise then was to attempt to stay the onsurge of statism. I am encouraged by the number of my colleagues who have joined forces in the crusade over the years, but obviously we have lost ground. Now more than ever our determination must be renewed, for heaven help America if we do not succeed in a substantial curtailment of the administration's grandiose budget and all its implications.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to insert in the RECORD the following editorials: First, "Point of View," by William L. Ingersoll in the *Indiana, Pa., Evening Gazette* of January 26, 1968; second, "Federal Influence Constantly Growing," from the *Leader-Times of Kittanning, Pa.,* February 19, 1968; and third, "There Is Nothing Wrong With Socialism Except That It Doesn't Work," by Saskatchewan Premier W. Ross Thatcher in the *California Farm Bureau Monthly* of February 1968.

[From the *Indiana (Pa.) Gazette*, Jan. 26, 1968]

POINT OF VIEW

(By William L. Ingersoll)

Our prosperity is letting us down. As a nation—an exceedingly wealthy nation—Americans have come to think of money as the ne plus ultra of our national life. It has become an American folk-lore to think that money alone can accomplish everything.

A prominent business man has made a rather caustic observation, but it is one of rare incisiveness. He said: "Hell is paved with good appropriations."

Is there something that is proving detrimental to the nation? Make an appropriation. Is there mounting crime? Make an appropriation. Do we have school drop-outs? Make an appropriation.

Voting billions, then letting the objectives take care of themselves, might be good for the ruling political party. But is it effective? Might just as well give a dollar to a beggar and smugly think it is curing poverty.

As President Johnson looks about to try to find new ways and places to spend the taxpayer's money, he may think he is kidding the nation's voters. The mere allocation of some huge sum for an unhappy domestic situation, without a previous determination of a working program, properly manned for the job, is destined to do no good for anybody—except possibly the political hacks who receive large salaries just for being of the same political affiliation in an election year.

Anybody who has any sense at all knows there must be a human bridge to span the chasm between need and effectual alleviation of that specific need.

There is no instant Olympus.

Work toward an end in which all are concerned, is necessary. It must be, to be sure, a cure in which all divergent views may coalesce as a unit. If the working factors are not in agreement, it would be better to forgo an appropriation until an obvious demand is created through reliable media.

If the public cannot agree on the need, where is the sense in trying to bait the hook with billions of dollars in appropriations?

The needy seem never to benefit from what hilarious politicians have appropriated.

[From the *Kittanning (Pa.) Leader-Times*, Feb. 19, 1968]

FEDERAL INFLUENCE CONSTANTLY GROWING

Most Americans are concerned about rising federal expenditures and creeping federal influence in our lives.

At the same time, most Americans welcome aid from Washington whether it be for highways, schools or a thousand other areas of federal service.

The paradox was expressed last week in a talk before the Kittanning-Ford City Area Chamber of Commerce by John McCoy, director of federal funds for the Armstrong School District.

McCoy, like most of us, is concerned about the consequences of looking to Washington for aid.

"I soon realized after taking this job, how-

ever," McCoy said in his talk, "that every dollar we turn down goes to some other school district and does not represent a dollar saved by the federal government."

His observation is accurate.

Federal allocations are made, and they are spent. If one locality turns down an appropriation it goes to another.

Armstrong County turned down \$125,000 in federal funds for an airport a few years back, and the allocation went to some other communities.

It is a vicious cycle.

We are not suggesting that Armstrong County take the leadership in turning down federal money in the hope that other communities will do likewise. Federal programs, for the most part, are established to aid areas like ours.

It would be naive to assume that any other communities would follow suit in declining aid from any source, be it state or federal.

We do suggest that the problem must be tackled at the source of its inception in Congress. Any effective reductions in federal expenditures must come in economy cuts from that arm of the government.

When the funds are appropriated, however, we must conclude the only reasonable approach is to take advantage of them.

[From the California Farm Bureau Monthly, February 1968]

THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH SOCIALISM EXCEPT THAT IT DOESN'T WORK

(By the Honorable W. Ross Thatcher, Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan, Canada)

(NOTE.—The Honorable W. Ross Thatcher, premier of the province of Saskatchewan, Canada is the guest editorialist this issue. The materials below were taken from the Premier's address before the 40th annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

(Thatcher graduated from Queen's University in Ontario at the age of 18. In his early twenties, he became a city councillor of Moose Jaw, the city where he lived in his youth. In 1945, he was elected a member of the Canadian House of Commons as one of the youngest men ever to enter the federal Parliament. He served there until 1953.

(He was chosen leader of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan in 1959, and in 1960 won a seat in the provincial legislative assembly. In 1964 he led his party to victory in a general election, bringing to an end 20 years of Socialist rule in Saskatchewan and accepting the job of reinstating private enterprise in his province.

(An outspoken and uncompromising exponent of the free enterprise system, Thatcher is known across Canada as a man who speaks his mind in clear and straight-forward language.

(Besides his preoccupation with matters of state, he owns a highly successful grain and cattle ranch and specializes in the breeding of Hereford cattle.)

Saskatchewan, with a population of slightly under one million people, for 20 years from 1944 to 1964 had a socialist government. This has been about the only one in North America, except Castro's. Four years ago, we defeated that government.

Saskatchewan is primarily agriculture. We have many well-to-do and efficient farmers. We have one of the higher standards of living in the world. The question is frequently asked: "How did socialism take over? How did it last for 20 years?"

To find an answer, one must go back to the dark days of the depression. In the 1930's a terrible drought struck. Year after year, crop failure followed crop failure. At the same time, the world price of wheat dropped to less than 35 cents per bushel. These two factors brought our prairie economy to its knees.

In those days, we had no unemployment

insurance, no crop insurance, no old age pensions. At one time, almost two-thirds of the entire population was forced to take direct relief. Unemployment was everywhere. Men lost their dignity and their self-respect.

Of course, the government and the economic system of the day were blamed. Out of the depths of the depression, the socialist party which glibly promised to solve these terrible problems was born. Among other things, the Socialists proposed: 1) to end unemployment; 2) to provide jobs by building socialist factories; 3) to provide free medical and health services; and 4) to give a new deal to the farmer. Thus as a protest to depression conditions, in 1944 Saskatchewan elected a Socialist government.

And for 20 long years, our people were subjected to a leather lunged propaganda machine—paid for from public funds—which filled the air with plausible platitudes and clichés.

You have heard some of them: "Tax the rich to help the poor" . . . "the capitalist is an exploiter of the masses" . . . "only a planned economy is the answer to unemployment" . . . and so on. They had all the answers.

How did they succeed?

In 1944, the socialists said they would solve the unemployment problem by building government factories. Not only this, they promised to use the profits from these socialist enterprises to build highways, schools, hospitals, and to finance better social welfare measures generally.

Over the years they set up 22 so-called Crown Corporations. I wish that time permitted me to tell you of the fiasco which followed. By the time we had taken over the government—3½ years ago—almost half of the Crown Corporations had gone bankrupt or been disposed. Others were kept operating by repeated and substantial government grants.

Virtually, without exception, those which have had to compete with private enterprise on equal terms lost huge sums of money regularly and consistently. Even the monopolies have displayed little business efficiency.

The whole Crown Corporation program became bogged down in a morass of bungling, red tape and inefficiencies. The experiment cost the taxpayer of Saskatchewan millions of dollars.

WAR ON BUSINESS

During the whole period, the Socialists waged war against private business. They passed legislation, giving government power to expropriate and operate any industry or business in province.

The making of profits was condemned as an unforgivable sin. The public and avowed objective of the Socialist government was to "eradicate capitalism."

What was the result?

Investors from eastern Canada, from Europe, from the United States, simply turned their backs on the Socialists. Industry after industry looked over sites in our province, only to by-pass Saskatchewan and locate elsewhere in Canada. Dozens of oil companies pulled up stakes, stock and barrel, and moved out of the province, because of discriminatory legislation.

Gas exploration ground to a complete halt. Prospecting in our vast north became almost non-existent. During the period Canada was experiencing the greatest economic boom in her history, Saskatchewan received only a handful of new factories.

From 1945 to 1963, more than a million new industrial jobs were created across Canada. Yet in Saskatchewan, after 18 years of socialism, there were fewer jobs in manufacturing than existed in 1945—this despite the investment of \$500 million in Crown Corporations.

SOCIAL SERVICES

As I said earlier, prior to taking office the socialists promised a greatly expanded program of social welfare measures. There was

to be "free" medical care; "free" hospitalization care; "free" drugs and so on.

The money to finance these projects was to come from the profits of the Crown Corporations. Of course, in the overall picture, there were no profits—rather there were colossal losses. Thus, the welfare program had to be financed from taxation.

Most people in Saskatchewan like the principle of our hospitalization plan—all hospital bills are paid by the government from tax revenue. However, in 20 years costs have gone from \$7½ million to \$74 million.

Four years ago, a medical care scheme was introduced under which all medical bills are paid. The same pattern of sky-rocketing costs is evident also in this field. Our people have found that medicare and hospitalization are anything but "free." On the contrary, they will cost our people \$120 million this year, and are still rising 10 percent annually.

TAXES

Under the socialist government, our provincial debt went from \$150 million to \$600 million. During the period more than 600 completely new taxes were introduced, 650 other taxes were increased. Per capita taxes in Saskatchewan were soon substantially out of line with our sister provinces—one more reason why industry located elsewhere.

COMPULSION USED

All throughout their regime, the socialists tended to use compulsion. Repeatedly their boards and agencies were manned by some social theorists who told businessmen how their businesses should be run.

Everyone in the north was forced by law to sell his timber to the government monopolized timber board. Every trapper was forced to sell his fur through the government fur marketing board. Every fisherman who caught a fish was forced by law to sell it through the government fish board. Every purchaser of an automobile license was forced to take his insurance from the Government Insurance Company. Four years ago they introduced a medical plan where every doctor would have been forced to receive his remuneration from the government. Only an aroused public opinion forced them to withdraw this contentious legislation.

POPULATION

Twenty years ago, the socialists promised to make Saskatchewan a Mecca for the working man. Instead, we saw the greatest mass exodus of people out of an area since Moses led the Jews out of Egypt more than 3,000 years ago.

Each of the other nine provinces which had a "private enterprise" government increased in population by leaps and bounds after 1945. On the other hand, virtually speaking, Saskatchewan stood still. (She increased 12 percent while the nation increased 60 percent.) In two decades, 270,000 of our citizens left Saskatchewan to find employment elsewhere.

SOCIALIST DEFEAT

Finally, 3½ years ago, our people decided they had been the Canadian guinea pig for the socialists long enough. They threw them out.

The Saskatchewan Liberal Party campaigned on a straight program of private enterprise. We made no extravagant social welfare promises. Instead, we committed ourselves to reduced government spending, reduced taxes, an incentive program for industry and so on. The people gave us the job of cleaning up the mess.

Is there a lesson to be learned from Saskatchewan's experiences?

I think there is . . . a rather horrible lesson.

If there are any Americans who think that socialism is the answer, I wish they would come to Saskatchewan and study what has happened in our province. Twenty years of socialism gave my province industrial stagnation.

tion, retarded development, oppressive taxation and major depopulation.

In our province we know socialism not from text books but from hard, bitter experience. We have found that there is nothing wrong with socialism, except that it doesn't work.

I am sure you have heard some people say: "We don't agree with socialism, we wouldn't support it generally, but a little bit of socialism might be all right."

We found in Saskatchewan that a little bit of socialism is like a little bit of pregnancy. Once it begins to develop, it is pretty hard to stop.

I think we can all be proud of the private enterprise system. But, I also think we must be vigilant. The danger from socialism, far too frequently, is not what they can do directly, but what they can accomplish indirectly. Far too often we find political parties which pay lip service to the principles of private enterprise, but at the same time for the sake of political expediency endeavor to neutralize the socialists by adopting large segments of their program.

To develop such a course can only be disastrous.

THE PENDING LEGISLATION WOULD HELP TO ALLEVIATE NOISE POLLUTION

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, noise pollution is rapidly becoming one of the chief irritants in the daily lives of many of our citizens. Although city residents have contended with it for several centuries—Julius Caesar banned chariots on the streets of Rome during certain hours because of their intolerable noise—noise is now viewed as a major environmental hazard, and the prospects are that the noise level will continue to increase.

President Johnson in his conservation message of March 8 recognized the severity of this problem. He told the Congress:

The crescendo of noise—whether it comes from truck or jackhammer, siren or airplane—is more than an irritating nuisance. It intrudes on privacy, shatters serenity and can inflict pain.

He stated further:

I am directing all departments of Government to take account of noise factors in choosing the location and design of buildings, highways and other facilities whose construction is assisted by Federal funds.

The President also urged the Congress to take prompt action on legislation to strengthen the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to deal with aircraft noise.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly concur with this recommendation and wish to emphasize its importance. The nuisance value of noise and its political and economic implications are fairly obvious, but the social and direct medical hazards of increasing noise levels are not yet fully appreciated.

Press reports have, from time to time, alluded to the problem. In an article in the Christian Science Monitor on March 9, 1968, Marian Sorenson stated:

A task force reported to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare last summer: "An individually acceptable amount of water

pollution, added to a tolerable amount of air pollution, added to a bearable amount of noise and congestion can produce a totally unacceptable health environment."

But more ominous and more direct warnings have been sounded. In the Medical Tribune of January 4, 1968, Dr. Samuel Rosen pointed out:

At the Central Institute for the Deaf in St. Louis, chinchillas and guinea pigs were exposed to brief, intermittent periods of above-normal—but supposedly tolerable—noise levels. They developed swollen cochlear membranes and obliteration of inner-ear hair cells . . . loud noises cause effects which the recipient cannot control. The blood vessels constrict, the skin pales, the muscles tense, and adrenal hormone is suddenly injected into the blood stream . . . loud noise can increase body tensions, which can then affect the blood pressure, the functions of the heart, and nervous system . . . Noise can cause enough emotional response and frustration to make a person feel nervous, irritable and anxious. Rest, relaxation, and peaceful sleep are interrupted . . . We now have millions with heart disease, high blood pressure, and emotional illnesses who need protection from the additional stress of noise.

I think it is obvious that people who are not ill should also be entitled to protection from severe noise stress which, according to studies, can make them more irritable, more susceptible to illness, and less efficient in their work. It has been estimated that the general noise level in major cities in the United States has been rising at the rate of 1 decibel a year for the last 30 years. With the continuing growth of jet air traffic—estimated to increase to over 2,900 jet aircraft in the skies in less than 10 years, as compared with 725 at the beginning of 1966—and the potential problem of severe sonic boom in connection with a commercial supersonic transport, the decibel level could undergo a precipitous and unforeseen rise in the near future.

It is interesting to note that common decibel-tolerance levels are described as 50 to 90 decibels for the annoyance threshold, 110 decibels for the discomfort threshold, and 129 decibels for the pain threshold. A city street riveter is estimated at 130 decibels and jet takeoff is rated at 150 decibels.

Of course, distance from the source will lessen the noise level, and a great deal of discussion has taken place about "land-use requirements" for the areas surrounding airports in order to alleviate the extreme problem of airport-area residents. It should be clear that this is an unsatisfactory remedy. Although it may have value as part of a larger approach to the protection of citizens from excessive noise hazard, it cannot take into account or affect the increasing volume of air traffic or the increasing noise level of individual aircraft which, combined, will simply raise the noise level and invalidate any gains to be made by land-use requirements.

Although air traffic is not the only component of the noise pollution problem, clearly it is increasingly the major factor. Solutions must be found before the problem becomes a serious national health hazard. The aerospace industry, which reaps great profits from the aircraft which creates the problem, should be expected to play a major part in finding solutions. It is unreasonable to ex-

pect industry to spend its time and money for such purposes unless required to do so.

Legislation is pending now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which would permit Federal regulation of aircraft noise. H.R. 3400 would enable the Secretary of Transportation to set noise standards and require compliance. Congress should not encourage further delay by postponing action on this request for regulatory power. Quieter engine technology is already known to exist in industry. By obtaining the power to regulate and projecting a timetable for implementation, the Government can definitively encourage industry to use its own resources to this end. Action should be taken on H.R. 3400, and additional legislative steps should soon follow.

I urge my colleagues to give their immediate attention to H.R. 3400. Programs for the control and abatement of aircraft noise must be formulated now if we are to have any relief from what will increasingly become a serious menace to society.

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, much that has been written about the New Hampshire primary has been distorted or overstated. Not so with the lead editorial appearing in the Evening Star on March 13, 1968.

To those who may be interested in a succinct summary of the principal significance of the New Hampshire primary, I commend the reading of the following editorial:

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The most obvious interpretation to put upon the outcome of the New Hampshire primaries is that President Johnson's re-election in November, assuming he runs, is very much in doubt.

Senator Eugene McCarthy, who was supposed to be something of a sacrificial offering, ran up a surprising 42 percent of the Democratic vote. The President's share was 49 percent in the form of write-ins.

It would be rash to read too much into the outcome of one primary, especially in relation to a general election that is eight months away. A favorable turn in the war, for example, could radically revise the picture. Still, if the New Hampshire figures are even an approximate reflection of sentiment within the Democratic ranks, if anything like 42 percent of the party faithful are prepared to turn thumbs down on their President, this may indeed turn out to be a Republican year. This is the more so in view of the fact that the call for Senator Robert F. Kennedy, who stayed out of New Hampshire, came in the form of a muted whisper—a mere one percent on a write-in basis.

Over on the Republican side it was all Nixon, who took 79 percent of the vote. There is in fact a good chance that he will wind up with more votes than the total cast for all other hopefuls in both primaries. In view of Nixon's pressing need to prove himself as a vote-getter, this sends him off to a flying start.

Governor Rockefeller, whose name was not on the ballot, emerged with about 11 percent of the GOP vote. His backers had mailed out 250,000 postcards urging write-ins for the New York governor, and they obviously expected their man to do better than he did.

Rockefeller said the Nixon victory was "not politically significant." This is about par for the political comment course. But if Rockefeller entertains such thoughts, even for a moment, he had better put them out of his mind. At the very least, Nixon's New Hampshire showing means that the New York governor must go into the Oregon primary—and must win it in impressive fashion.

Finally, what does New Hampshire tell us about the war in Vietnam?

Senator McCarthy, though he attacked the President on a broad front in the closing phases of the campaign, ran primarily as an antiwar candidate, and his unexpectedly strong showing must be appraised accordingly. If there is any comfort for those, including ourselves, who believe that the United States must see it through in Vietnam, it will be found in the fact that the combined vote for the President and Nixon, who has been well over on the hawkish side, far exceeded that cast for the dove-like Senator from Minnesota.

YOUTH IN POLITICS

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, young people looking for a cause would do well to channel their enthusiasm in the direction of political efforts this year rather than beatnikism, peacenikism, and escapism via the psychedelic with an assist or two from pot, speed, or LSD.

Politics is challenging, rewarding, productive, and consuming. Those who want to withdraw from Vietnam can find their candidate. Those who want to win can find theirs. Those who just plain want something—whatever it may be—have the chance to organize and work in a tangible way between now and next November for the candidate or cause of their choice. In this connection, I commend to the reading of all who are interested in this new direction of youthful activity the following column by Richard Wilson in the Evening Star of March 13, 1968:

YOUTH TAKES A REFRESHING DIP INTO POLITICS
(By Richard Wilson)

How do we measure what unquestionably is the worst condition of ferment this country has been in for many years? We measure it in terms of racial disorders, of deepening involvement in an unpopular war, and of the deepening estrangement of an entire generation from elder generations considered to have gotten the entire world into an irretrievable mess.

Consolation can be found, however, in the recent discovery of the estranged generation that a system which they do not like provides them with the means of changing it. The means of change is built into our political processes, and now that the alienated generation has discovered this it seems happier than before.

Love-ins, pot and LSD are not enough. The alienated generation is discovering that there is more excitement, fun and reward in the good, old-fashioned American political

system where what you think can be made to count if you try hard enough.

The campus revolt has moved into politics. Vietnams, long hairs, students, professors, clergy of the Protestant, Jewish and Catholic faiths, and even some strong-minded nuns who understand the modern generation, have learned how to move in on the established political hierarchy.

They did so in recent Democratic-Farmer Labor caucuses in Minnesota, winning from one-fourth to one-third of that state's national convention delegates for their peace candidate, Sen. Eugene McCarthy.

This is not an isolated instance of effective political action by the new left and the anti-war factions. California, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut are battlegrounds of greater or lesser degree in the political uprising of the estranged generation.

Democratic National Chairman John Bailey finds himself beleaguered in the relatively closed political system of his home state of Connecticut. He may have to give way to the peace factions in some degree.

Sen. Eugene McCarthy may win up to 100,000 votes in Massachusetts in the uncontested primary for control of that state's delegation to the Democratic National Convention. College students invaded New Hampshire to bring Senator McCarthy's vote as near as possible to a threatening level. Wisconsin will be the next scene of the New Left revolt as doves who have suddenly sprouted claws take advantage of the opening provided by the withdrawal of Gov. George Romney in the Republican primary.

Since there no longer is a serious contest in that primary with Richard M. Nixon, the Republican doves are free to fly into the Democratic primary and make their discontent felt with votes for McCarthy. The campus elements and the pacifistic clergy will be possibly more active in Wisconsin than in New Hampshire.

All this adds up to something new and refreshing in American politics. The revolt of youth and the youthful-minded seemed at first merely another manifestation of nihilism, a worship of nothingness which periodically emerges in one generation or another.

But as organized labor found at a much earlier date, political action is a better remedy for frustrations and disappointments than refuge in a drop-out cult.

This is the first heartening news we have had from the alienated generation in some time. Politics has more addicts and is probably headier than marijuana, and more fun than dressing up in old clothes with a flower in your hair.

There is this about it: Some of the political activists of the New Left merely wish to tear down the system. They have no idea with what to replace it. This knowledge may come to them as they range farther on the political scene. In the meantime their frustrations are being channeled into something more than mere protest demonstration and that is all to the good. We might even get some future leaders out of this experience.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the Nation are deeply indebted to our late colleague and Speaker, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., for his service and dedica-

tion to his Country, his State, his congressional district, and the Republican Party. The man—his spirit and his accomplishments—cannot be separated from the history of the U.S. House of Representatives, and the effects of his dedication and service will continue to be felt for many years to come.

Joe Martin was no ordinary man. He was the son of a Massachusetts blacksmith. He held a high school diploma. He was awarded 10 honorary degrees from some of our Nation's finest universities. He served his country and his State for 42 years as a Member of the House of Representatives. He sat as the Speaker of the House and was for many years the enthusiastic, loyal, and respected leader of the minority party. His determination, vigor, and intellectual ability made him the leader of the legislative body he loved so deeply and to which he dedicated his life.

Joe Martin moved with the times. His last committee assignment in this House was on the Committee on Science and Astronautics, as this Nation embarked on a national program to develop the peaceful uses of space—an extraordinary youth of spirit for a man born less than 20 years after the Civil War—and yet, not extraordinary when one considers the man. Certainly one of the most satisfying aspects of my service in Congress was the privilege to work with Joe Martin as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

We shall miss Joe Martin. The Nation will miss Joe Martin. We are richer for his having been among us. He exemplified the philosophy expressed by another son of Massachusetts, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, when he said:

I think it is required of a man that he should share the action and passion of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived.

There is no doubt that Joe Martin lived. For that, we have all had our lives enriched, and for that we are eternally grateful.

NIXON IS A WINNER

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there will be many efforts by the liberal press in the months ahead to minimize the tremendous victory of Dick Nixon in New Hampshire. Governor Romney's last-minute withdrawal in the face of disastrous defeat is being used by many to indicate the victory was without real meaning.

This is nonsense. It is an even greater victory to overwhelm your opponent so greatly that he retreats under fire. Both contenders went to New Hampshire with the commitment that they would win and they had to win. The fight was fair and square. Dick Nixon won.

Mr. Speaker, I have gladly supported Dick Nixon as the best man to bring responsible leadership to a nation which is clearly in turmoil and at a perilous crossroads. I am very pleased that the overwhelming majority of New Hampshire Republicans also support Dick Nixon, a winner.

JOHN HOUCHIN COMMENTS ON STAFF MEMORANDUM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the executive committee of Phillips Petroleum Co., Mr. John Houchin, made a thoughtful and provocative speech at the winter meeting of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. Mr. Houchin's comments were directed at the Attorney General's 1967 Interstate Oil Compact report, and the staff memorandum attached to that report.

Mr. Houchin is a native of my hometown, Muskogee, Okla., and he speaks from a lifetime of experience in the oil business. I believe his remarks are excellent, and worthy of study and consideration.

It is noteworthy, in evaluating these remarks, that the Attorney General's report on the oil compact, which is required by the Congress, is not critical of the compact or its operation. In Mr. Houchin's words, it "gives a clean bill of health."

The attached staff memorandum, however, is another matter entirely, and raises major questions of both policy and motivation—on which the Attorney General's report is silent.

Since both have been made a matter of record, it seems both fair and instructive to make Mr. Houchin's informative comments available in this RECORD.

The text follows:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S 1967 INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT REPORT—AN INDUSTRY VIEWPOINT FROM 35 YEARS' EXPERIENCE

(By John M. Houchin, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla., to 1967 Winter Meeting, Interstate Oil Compact Commission, New Orleans, La., December 12, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, honorable governors and other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I am pleased to appear here today for two reasons. One is that it enables me to participate in the activities of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. My Company, my associates and I have a deep sense of respect and appreciation for the Compact and its accomplishments. We have been close to the Compact since its inception in 1935. The industry, mineral owners, states, consuming public, and our nation all owe the Compact an immeasurable debt of gratitude. It is an outstanding example of state, Federal, and industry cooperation and achievement.

The other reason I am pleased to appear here is that it provides me the opportunity, as a member of the oil and gas industry and drawing on 35 years first-hand experience, to respond to the Attorney General's recent report and its attached staff memorandum, on the Compact.

It is perhaps misleading to say I shall respond to the report and the memorandum, because what is of concern is *not* the Attorney General's four-page report. All the report does is to continue to give to the Compact and the member states a clean bill of health. A report on the Compact and member states is all that Congress requires. What is of concern is the 87-page unsigned staff memorandum which was attached to the report. The memorandum goes far beyond the purpose of the report by presenting an abundance of *misinformation* about the petroleum industry. Its attachment to the report makes the report itself a vehicle for expounding and publishing an unwarranted and misleading criticism of the larger units of our industry.

My response is to this memorandum which I was quite surprised to see because it needlessly runs so counter to the growing trend of government-industry cooperation so apparent in the last year. To respond in detail to the lengthy memorandum within the time allotted to me is impossible. It takes half a day alone to read it with any depth of analysis. It purports to cover every major phase of this vast industry's activities. In addition, it is filled with an untold number of miscellaneous, repetitious and misleading statements, veiled suggestions and innuendo. All can and should be answered, but not in a short speech. The only thing I can do here is to demonstrate the memorandum's lack of responsibility by calling your attention to the authors' lack of information, discussing a few of the more important matters covered, and briefly referring to others.

Let me say at this point that my comments do not mean that the memorandum does not have its pluses, for it does. It does not criticize the Compact or the actions of the member states. Also, it recognizes the need for and the great achievements to date of the states' conservation programs from the standpoint of prevention of waste, greater recovery of oil and gas, and the protection of correlative rights. It recognizes the need for the control of production as a means of preventing waste. It limits all of this only to the extent of saying that the program has not as yet reached "the ideal." This must be admitted. It never will. There is much left to be done. This, however, does not minimize the tremendous achievement of the program over the last 35 years and the continuing rapid progress as of today. In my personal experience within the industry, I have seen conditions before and after. The states, the nation, the public and even the Department of Justice can be proud of what has been done.

Moreover, I do not mean to be personally critical of the authors of the memorandum or to question their sincerity of purpose. My associates and I have known and have the highest personal regard for those on the Attorney General's staff known to be involved. However, I must point out that it is clear from the memorandum that they are not familiar with the basic facts and practical problems involved in the oil business. Much of their knowledge of the business appears to be second-hand and hearsay. The ideas expressed have the familiar ring of the relatively small group of professional critics of the oil industry. These critics consist mainly of the theoretical textbook economists and college professors who have the profits from their books or grants as an incentive for attacking the big companies in the oil industry which have for far too long been convenient and all too submissive whipping boys. One such book, just off the press, by two college professors, was discussed yesterday in the Legal Committee. The staff memorandum expressly cites and relies largely on this type of material as its misguided authority. It is a case of the blind leading the blind.

The authors of the memorandum are careful in attempting to avoid direct misstatements. They thus qualify many major state-

ments by words such as, "it would appear," "it may be," "it is possible," "there is some evidence," thus and so "may reflect," and similar qualifications.

The memorandum contains this statement, and I quote: "A valid fact is a prerequisite to a valid decision." This highlights the fallacy of the memorandum's malignment of the industry. It is not based on *valid* facts, as if there were any other kind. The thesis of the memorandum is not a criticism of the benefits and achievements of the state conservation program or the Compact. Its main thesis is rather that the integrated companies are constituted and intentionally operated to take an undue advantage of the conservation program for selfish ends to the detriment of the public, the consumers, and the so-called independent or non-integrated units of the industry, and that these companies use the program as a price control device. In other words, it is, in reality, a frontal assault upon the responsibility and integrity of the integrated companies and not the conservation program, as such.

To develop its thesis, the memorandum broadens the definition of the conservation program to include the Federal tax laws such as the resource depletion allowance, cost depreciation and capital gains tax, which it calls incentives; import controls; public lands administration; the Connally Act; and even the gathering of statistics. This broad definition gives the staff the opportunity to voice the views of the critics on these subjects under the guise of reporting on the Compact.

Let us review just a few of the major points of emphasis of the memorandum as evidence of its basic fallacy.

First, here is a statement in the Attorney General's report relating to the emphasis of the memorandum. It says, and I quote:

"The emphasis in this memorandum reflects a primary concern with the overall control structure as it affects the ability of the industry, as a part of the competitive free enterprise system to supply desirable products of adequate quality at objectively determined prices with greatest efficiency."

Why should the Attorney General or his staff attorneys, quoting from a few textbook economists, question the ability of a proven industry to supply the nation with "desirable products" of "adequate quality" at "objectively determined prices" with "greatest efficiency?"

Is there any legitimate question the industry does not have this ability, and has not exercised it with maximum efficiency? And it is an industry made up of thousands of units, each highly competitive, but cooperating to find, produce, gather, transport, refine, and distribute to every hamlet and crossroad in the whole of our nation, to our great industrial complex, and to our Armed Forces, the finest products of unquestioned quality, in abundant quantities, with the greatest efficiency, at prices shockingly low in relation to the prices of most other commodities. When has the industry ever failed to meet its responsibility? Not once.

I was amused recently when some of those outside the industry, as a disguise for increasing cheap imports, indicated concern over the ability of the industry to meet this winter's fuel oil needs as a result of the serious dislocations resulting from the Middle East situation. Admiral Lattu, who as Director of the Interior Department's Office of Oil and Gas, has come to know the problems and ability of the industry, was quick to reply. He said, "In its reaction to the *vast dislocations* of last summer, the petroleum industry has *once again* proved its *flexibility and responsiveness*. I see no reason why it should do less in the present case."

The 1957 Suez crisis was another example. Responsiveness and maximum responsibility have been the hallmark of the oil and gas industry.

Quite naturally, the industry has had, still has, and will always have problems of great concern. But who is better qualified to know and solve these problems than the industry that has been so successful and has done such a tremendous job to date against great odds. To fail to solve such problems and to give to the consuming public the maximum possible satisfaction with regards to quality, quantity, and price would mean the self-destruction of the industry. Serving the public adequately and economically is the industry's life blood. I can tell you that the industry does not intend to commit suicide.

The memorandum attributes to the state conservation programs a primary purpose diametrically opposed to the facts—that is, *to stabilize crude oil markets and maintain price*. This is a claim that was asserted early in the development of the state conservation programs but has long since been put to rest by the courts. The courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, have consistently held that although conservation laws and regulations with respect to oil, including market demand proration, may have an incidental effect on price or markets, as would any other regulation, *that is not their intent, purpose, or use*. The language of the state statutes and of the Compact is contrary to such a purpose. The real purpose was clearly held to be the *prevention of the physical waste of oil and gas resulting from production in excessive rates and in excess of available markets or marketing facilities, the protection of the reservoir, and the protection of correlative rights*. The court decisions not only held that the laws did not authorize consideration of price, but found no evidence that the regulatory agencies were taking price into account. None of these decisions has been overruled or even criticized in any of the many subsequent cases. Have the college economic cliques become qualified to interpret the intent and thrust of the law than the courts?

Even if stabilization of markets and price was a correlative purpose of the conservation laws, *which is not so*, I personally see no real objection—in fact can see a tremendous advantage—in an effort to stabilize the market and the price paid for oil so far as the public, the consumers, and the economies of the states and the nation are concerned. The Federal Government has spent millions of dollars to effect such a stabilization of markets and prices in agriculture, and other industries basic to the public interest. Unstabilized markets, and boom and bust prices, in respect to any essential product are damaging not only to the economy of the industry, but likewise to the consumers, the states, and the nation. My point here, however, is that this has not been and is not the purpose of the state conservation programs.

While on the subject of prices, let us take a look at the prices and so-called price effects the memorandum complains about. The memorandum nowhere *directly* says that the prices of crude oil and products are excessive or in any way out of line. It does this, however, by innuendo and unsupported remarks. The memorandum talks about the prices not being determined objectively; about the added burden placed on, or the cost to the consumer; about undesirable price reaction; about the price in relation to imports; and the like. We can assume that neither the staff nor the consumer is concerned about the prices being too low, although they should be concerned from the standpoint of future supply.

The fact is that the average price for crude oil over the period of real effectiveness of our present conservation system, say since 1935, is lower, in terms of constant dollars, than during the pre-conservation years. This result has come in spite of spiraling inflations, the skyrocketing cost of labor and equipment, the

cost of drilling to depths of 15,000 to 20,000 feet as compared to 3,000 to 6,000 feet prior to the conservation era, the cost of new methods of greater recovery, higher taxes paid with respect to the oil, and millions of dollars spent in research to further improve the means of finding and recovering oil. As for comparison of a more recent period, using the 1957-59 average as a base, the average U.S. crude oil price through November has declined 2.3% from \$3.00 a barrel to \$2.93.

Let us look at the gasoline prices paid by the consumer. After deducting the direct gasoline taxes paid at the pump, the price to the consumer today for 100 octane gasoline with its various other additives is not much higher than was paid for 85 or lesser octane gasoline 20 years ago, in spite of inflation. As for a more recent period, for the first six months of this year the average price of gasoline to the consumer, excluding taxes, was only 4.2% higher than the 1957-59 average. This slight 4.2% rise compares with an increase in the consumer price index of 15.2% during the same period. This is not considering the many added services included with the purchase of a tank of gasoline.

If the conservation program is designed to maintain higher prices of crude oil and products, it is doing a poor job. It is, however, continuing to do a good job preventing waste, increasing recovery, and protecting correlative rights.

I do want to emphasize one thing at this point, however. That is, unless crude oil and product prices are permitted to increase in line with other prices there will be, in time, a severe shortage of domestic reserves of crude oil and natural gas. I am not an alarmist. This isn't going to happen tomorrow or the next day. There is, however, a judgment day. The only way to find and develop new domestic reserves is to pay the rapidly increasing cost necessary for that purpose. This can only come from an increased price for crude oil, which of necessity means a higher price for products, the only source from which the money can come.

The economists glibly say, "Cut your costs." The industry is doing its dead-level best to do this against odds and considerations some college professors know nothing about. The oil industry is not made up of fools. With the price of its products failing to keep pace with the consumers price index, it has more reason than most industries to reduce its costs to the minimum to preserve its profits from the cost-price squeeze.

Some economists urge a greater use of cheap imports. May I say here, woe to the public, our state and national economy, and our national defense, if we turn to reliance on uncertain, so-called cheap imports for our petroleum supplies. This can be avoided only by a strong domestic industry. And a strong domestic industry requires an adequate price for its oil and products.

Oil from shale or coal, tar sands, atomic energy, and other substitute energy sources are possibilities in years to come, when their "price is right." It would be risky to depend to any great extent upon substitutes when work to date casts doubt on their economic competitiveness until such time as prices for crude oil and natural gas in most areas have advanced substantially.

I feel that there are ample domestic petroleum reserves for a long time to come if, and only if, a proven and responsible industry is allowed to receive a compensatory price and continue with an ever-improving state conservation program without undue interference from those who know nothing of the practical problems of the business. This includes getting the maximum recovery of the oil from known reserves by secondary and other advanced means of recovery, and the protection of the small or stripper wells which are vital to the overall supply.

Perhaps one of the most fallacious inferences of the memorandum is that the inte-

grated companies intentionally and willfully shift their income to the production level, by the payment of arbitrary and excessive well-head prices, to obtain an undue benefit from the 27½ percentage depletion allowance. The authors talk about the keeping of separate sets of books and deceptive internal accounting for this purpose. No factual examples are cited. A concluding paragraph of the memorandum, remote from the main charge, admits, however, that this is only and I quote, "a theoretical incentive," unquote, and that its, quote, "practical consequences," unquote, are not defined.

I can speak only for Phillips, but what I say must be true as to the other companies because their wellhead and other prices, because of competition, are comparable. *There is not a word of truth in this insinuation of the memorandum.* The operating departments and subsidiary companies of Phillips compete with one another for making the maximum profit from their particular level of operation. There is no internal pricing, deception, or keeping of separate books to show otherwise. *There is no effort or intent to increase the wellhead price of crude oil to seek a greater return from the depletion allowance. The wellhead prices are arrived at objectively, as I will explain.* We challenge the Attorney General's staff to show otherwise.

We would be foolish to do what the memorandum suggests the big oil companies do in this respect. Phillips has been an outspoken leader in advocating higher crude oil prices to compensate for the cost of exploration, development, and acquisition of needed reserves. It took the lead in the last two general price increases. It so happens, however, that Phillips net domestic crude oil production is less than 40% of the crude oil requirements for its domestic refineries. It would certainly be poor business for Phillips to raise the price paid for the portion of its requirements purchased from others in exchange for the much smaller return from the depletion tax savings from higher prices for its own production. I am not an economist, but I can figure that one out.

Increasing the wellhead price for crude oil is a necessary competitive move to obtain the required supply and is not a tax gimmick. When the memorandum says there is no competition in the acquisition of crude oil requirements, the authors have been misled and do not know what they are talking about. There is keen competition and the supply is keenly responsive to a change in price, given a reasonable time. *It is this competition that is largely responsible for the stabilization and equalization of prices, and not the conservation program.* Two competing grocers side by side cannot for long charge different prices for the same standard brand of coffee. The flow of trade and the cost factor will quickly put a stop to that. The response may be slower in the case of oil because of the inconvenience and expense of changing buyer connections. A seller will wait longer to see what his buyer will do, feeling that he will no doubt follow the price increase or that the instigators of the price increase will, for competitive reasons, be forced to return to the old price. Given a reasonable time, however, the sellers will begin changing their buyer connections to get the higher price.

Let me cite an example of how competition establishes crude oil prices. Only recently, in the case of one price increase, we were in need of a greater supply of certain crude oil. We increased the price. After a time we obtained some of our requirements through the price increase. This advantage was soon lost, however, as our competitors met the price increase. Experience, not theory, has made us keenly aware that crude oil markets are competitive.

Contrary to the views of the memorandum, wellhead prices for crude oil are determined

objectively on the basis of value, modified by free competition, and other factual considerations *having no relation to the depletion allowance or to conservation laws.*

Again I cite the procedures of my Company as an illustration of how this works.

As a first step, the Manufacturing Department, taking into account its projected knowledge of probable product prices and knowing the types of crude oil necessary for the requirements of each refinery and the refining costs, analyzes the various types of oil to determine how much it can pay for each type and still make a fair profit from its operations. This is done just as if the Manufacturing Department were an independent refining company. All of the principles of *practical* economics are taken into account.

Second, we consider the possible sources of supplies, in relation particularly to the costs of transporting them to the refineries.

Third, we must consider the important element of competition, and competition is keen. If our price is less than that paid by our competitors we may not be able to purchase our requirements. If we pay more than our competitors, our costs may be such that we cannot compete in the product market. This is why, because of stiff competition, both in the crude oil and product markets, prices have a tendency to be parallel. It is not because of collusion, or conservation regulations, but because of *competition*. This, too, involves principles of *practical* economics.

Lastly, Phillips knows that the future domestic supply of oil depends upon the continuous and active exploration for new reserves on the part of the whole industry, including the independents. The independent is highly important in this respect. Such exploration depends almost entirely upon a price for the oil that will pay the cost of exploration, development, and operation, plus a fair return for the cost and risk involved. This, too, is a basic principle of *practical* economics. It follows that to the extent competition and other cost factors permit, Phillips attempts to adjust the price paid for crude oil upward to accomplish this very important objective.

I repeat that the other companies must follow the same pattern, because their prices are competitive and thus more or less parallel.

The memorandum also leaves the impression that the integrated companies retain an excessive percentage of proceeds from the depletion provision as profit without instead using all of the proceeds for further exploration, claimed to be the intended purpose of the provision. Without debating at this time the intended use or purpose of the provision, let me say that as to Phillips, there is no truth in the insinuation that it does not use the full amount of the tax savings for exploration and the finding of new domestic reserves. Each year we spend *more* than the full amount of the depletion tax savings for this purpose. The tax savings are *necessary* to do this. I am not talking about mere development of known reserves. I am talking about exploration for new reserves. On the basis of what I have observed of the operations of the other integrated companies, I believe the experience of the majority, if not all of them, is similar to that of Phillips.

I wish I had more time to talk about the depletion allowance, cost depreciation, and the capital gains tax. This subject, except for the facts stated above, is well covered in numerous treatises over many years. The memorandum is not a good or true exposition of the nature, purpose or effect, or even the criticisms, of such allowances.

The memorandum discusses at length what it refers to as the "barter" or "trade" of oil in the intermediate markets. This is the purchase and sale of oil between producers, purchasers, or takers of oil, at places other than the wellhead. The oil is of a type or in an amount not needed by one but needed by

the other at that location. The procedure avoids excessive transportation costs, gives to each the desired oil where needed, and adjusts for averages or shortages of supply. By thus lowering costs, this works to benefit the consumer. The memorandum says that the means adopted is primarily, in effect, the mere *trade* of the oil, barrel for barrel, and not an arms length sale and purchase at realistic prices. The purpose is said to be intentionally to obscure the so-called unrealistic and distorted wellhead prices.

Let me say categorically from the base of experience that this is not so. It is our practice and the practice of those we do business with, which is the majority, if not all, of the integrated companies, and many independent refiners, to effect the sale or exchange by straightforward contracts of sale and contracts of purchase at stated prices. Money changes hands. There is no involved balancing of accounts. The procedure is not a mere barter or trade of oil, barrel for barrel. *It is a simple sale and purchase.*

The price is, of course, based on the wellhead price, plus gathering and transportation costs and, in some instances, an incidental handling charge. But what seller is going to sell any commodity without taking his actual costs into account? What buyer expects to buy for less? I have already pointed out that the wellhead price is a realistic cost.

The memorandum is greatly concerned that the majority of the major pipeline transportation systems are owned by integrated refineries or affiliated pipeline companies. It contends that the major portion of the oil so transported is oil produced or purchased by the transporter, and that independent producers or refiners are thus unable to transport small, intermittent shipments of oil from place to place, as in the case of shipments of other commodities by differing types of common carriers, such as by railroad. Other parts of the memorandum, in fact, answer these concerns. The answer is simply that independent investors do not have the huge capital or an assured supply to provide the vast and costly pipeline facilities. Those most interested and capable are the owners of the refineries primarily served by the line. The required regularity, scheduling of shipments, and needed facilities do not lend themselves to the sporadic, small intermittent shipments of oil of various grades destined for numerous points. It would be like expecting a huge freight train to stop at every crossroad to pick up a stick of lumber or a bag of potatoes destined for some other crossroad. These are just the economic facts of life.

The pipeline system is doing an effective job. The memorandum does not question this. The public and the consumer would not have it otherwise. The memorandum cites no instance of abuse or discrimination.

The greatest concern expressed in the memorandum about the integrated refiners is limited, for the most part, to the so-called decrease in the population of the independent refineries and what is said to be an increase in "contract" refining. No criticism is made of the necessity for, or efficiency of, the large integrated refinery. The answer to this concern about the decrease in number of independent refiners lies in this economic fact of life and not in any bad practice of owners of the large and efficient refineries. The old tea kettles with worn out and obsolete facilities are just not capable of making the tremendous volumes and diversified high grade products demanded by the consumer. Many small, independent refiners do not have the capital or the ability to meet the responsibility created by the consumer's desires. They are somewhat similar to the owners of the small corner groceries which are rapidly being replaced by the supermarket. We may regret the passing of this home-spun part of America, but it works to the

advantage of the consumer who is the architect of the change.

It is nevertheless a fact that many of the small, independent refiners, through good management, have been able to improve their refinery facilities and continue as real competitors. In fact, I assure you they constitute some of our stiffest competition in the marketplace. This has been partly due to the ability to buy their crude supply in the intermediate market at competitive prices. Many, as stated in the memorandum, are integrating forward and backward, recognizing the need for such integration. The limited amount of contract refining has been a fruitful means to help keep a number of small refineries in business.

The memorandum claims that the integrated companies disperse their oil properties and production geographically purposely to avoid the risk of adverse conservation regulations in some of the states. Nothing could be farther from the truth, and it is such allegations as this that makes everything the memorandum states questionable. Anyone with the slightest knowledge of the oil business should know that a company's operations and its production are located where the oil is or may be found, without regard to conservation regulations. The fact is that when oil is discovered in a state with inadequate conservation laws and regulations, the integrated companies are the *first* to take the lead in sponsoring adequate laws and regulations for the state. *Ninety-eight per cent of all conservation laws and regulations have been sponsored by the industry itself, majors and independents alike, with the integrated companies usually taking the lead. They favor effective regulation.*

There are discussions in the memorandum about the integration generally within the industry, the "posting" of prices, marketing, imports, the Public Lands administration, gathering of statistics, and other facets of industry activity, which I would like to discuss but cannot because of limited time.

There is, however, one part of the memorandum which from the standpoint of substance is not of great significance, but which I have saved to the last because it so clearly shows the authors' lack of knowledge of what they call the conservation system. This part has to do with the Connally Hot Oil Act, which is no longer of real consequence because the effectiveness of state regulation is such as to make the enforcement of the Connally Act of minor importance.

In several places the authors refer to the Connally Act as being the act that granted "consent" to the enactment and enforcement by the states of their conservation laws and regulations. When I use the word "consent" I am quoting from the memorandum. They say without such "consent" the states would be without authority to so act. They say that if the Administration or Congress were to suspend the effectiveness of the Act, this would take away the "consent" and deprive the states of their authority with respect to conservation. They say that one reason this has not been done, or perhaps should not be done, is that the result would be too drastic.

If there is any part of the so-called conservation system that the Attorney General's staff should know about, it is the Connally Act, which is Federal legislation. They are responsible for its enforcement.

The facts are, however, according to the lawyers who advise me, that the Supreme Court of the United States, as early as 1901, and in numerous subsequent cases, has repeatedly held that the enactment and enforcement of state conservation laws and regulations are inherent prerogatives of the states, within their police powers, without any Federal "consent."

The Connally Act was not passed until after the enactment of a great body of the state conservation laws and regulations. It was passed simply as an aid to the enforce-

ment of existing state laws and not by way of "consent." There is nothing to the contrary in any court decision, the history of the act, or other responsible literature. It is no different from the act of Congress making it a criminal offense to transport stolen automobiles in interstate commerce. Such law was not passed to give a state consent to pass laws against, and prosecute the theft of automobiles. The state basically has that right. It was merely an aid. As I say, this merely shows the basic lack of knowledge of the authors of the staff memorandum as to the conservation system. Almost all of the memorandum is subject to this same deficiency.

The authors of the memorandum are frank in conclusion to say, and I quote:

"Final conclusions cannot validly be drawn from such a sketch," unquote, referring to their description of the conservation system and the activities of the industry. They merely suggest the need for further study.

I would have no objection to further study, other than that it would increase the cost that the economists are worrying about. But I should remind the authors and others who light upon the "time-worn" criticisms of the oil industry as though they'd suddenly discovered a new planet, that the matters raised in these criticisms have been studied and restudied by real experts with experience and knowledge, and each time the answer has been the same—no valid justification for the criticisms. The last and perhaps best study was the Efficiency Study conducted by the Compact, extending over a period of almost two years, and participated in by government and industry alike. It refutes the basic criticisms enumerated in the memorandum.

As I indicated earlier, the best answer to the unfounded criticisms lies in the superb performance record of the industry. Our big job in the industry is to make that record better known.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JERRY WORTHY, DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Mr. Jerry Worthy, Director of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, comes as a great shock to his many friends and associates. Jerry Worthy was a dedicated husband and father, a loyal public servant, a highly proficient professional, and a good friend. His unique abilities and his gifts of service to his family, his work, his community, and his country, will truly be missed.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a statement by Mr. John E. Horne, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board:

STATEMENT BY MR. JOHN E. HORNE, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The death of Jerry Worthy is a great loss to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, to the savings and loan industry it supervises, and indeed to the entire Federal Government. He was truly the people's servant both in his professional and non-professional life.

Few have mastered so well the art of giving to enable their fellowman to live a richer

life. Emerson must have had people like Jerry Worthy in mind when he said:

"Rings and jewels are not gifts, but apologies for gifts. The only true gift is a portion of thyself."

Jerry gave a portion of himself in everything he did, both in work and away from his office. I am richer in having known and worked with him. So is everyone else who had such a privilege.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OEO

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined in introducing a bill identical to the one cosponsored by 35 of our distinguished colleagues yesterday. Inadvertent circumstances prevented my name from being included with the principal sponsor, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] and the others who associated with him in the bill's introduction.

I strongly advocate the objectives of this legislation—providing \$200 million in supplemental appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity—and am privileged to be associated with its sponsorship.

It is imperative that additional funds be provided to finance special OEO summer activities aimed at poverty-area young people, of which New York has more than its share, and to strengthen year-round antipoverty programs.

Because supplemental funds are not now available to finance special summer projects, cutbacks in year-round OEO community action programs are being imposed. Surely no one who has read the Riot Commission report would agree to halting development of the antipoverty program during these critical times.

Summer programs should not have to operate at the expense of the year-round OEO activities. I would urge the earliest possible committee and floor action on this legislation.

THE PLATINUM FRAUD

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, according to today's news media, our colleague from the other body, and friend of the American taxpayer, the senior Senator of Delaware, revealed that a heavy contributor to the Democratic Party is the principal beneficiary to a \$12 million "windfall," if Congress approves the disposal of 115,000 troy ounces of platinum from our national stockpile. This political "crony" of the President is Charles W. Engelhard, who heads and controls a New Jersey-based company that is ne-

gotiating with the administration for the rare metal. I read that one of the other body's family is in his employment. The administration's plan is to dispose of the platinum by negotiation rather than by competitive bid. The net result of Senator WILLIAMS' findings is that Mr. Engelhard will be buying platinum at about one-half the market price, which could net him a profit of \$12 million. This is \$12 million that is being deceptively taken from the American taxpayer and makes the \$100,000 bribe involved in the "Teapot Dome" scandal seem like "peanuts." Furthermore, the requisite palladium has not replaced the platinum in the defense stockpile.

The legislation authorizing this disposal was passed by the House on December 14, 1967, at which time I was assured by the distinguished Armed Services Subcommittee chairman that:

The bill provides . . . the procedures which we will follow and very carefully check with respect to this disposal and the others that are to follow, (they) will be very carefully watched and very carefully supervised.

Mr. Speaker, it was upon this assurance that, even though it had not properly progressed through the subcommittee or full committee, I withheld objection and allowed this bill to pass. However, these assurances no longer exist, and in fact suggest a gigantic windfall at the taxpayer's expense.

Had I known at the time of passage that these circumstances existed or would develop, I would most certainly have strongly opposed this legislation. I am sure that the great majority of other Members would have joined me in this opposition. I certainly hope that the other body can mend the errors of our ways and remedy this "pig in a poke," by letting it rest in peace.

The news media articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 13, 1968]

PLATINUM "WINDFALL" BILL IS ASSAILED BY WILLIAMS

(By Robert Walters)

A company headed by a personal friend of President Johnson is a principal beneficiary under a government plan—described by Sen. John J. Williams as a "\$12 million windfall"—to sell surplus platinum far below the current market price.

Williams, a Delaware Republican, told the Senate yesterday that "the Johnson administration is desperately trying to obtain congressional approval of a bill to sell 115,000 troy ounces of platinum at \$12 million below prevailing market prices."

Williams added: "The administration seeks authority to dispose of this surplus platinum 'by negotiation,' rather than by sales through competitive bidding."

He said the "so-called 'negotiation' is a farce" because arrangements already have been made for two firms to purchase virtually all the platinum at a price of approximately \$100 per unit below current market prices.

The senator identified the two companies involved as the Engelhard Minerals and Chemicals Corp. of Newark, N.J., and Matthey Bishop Inc., of Malvern, Pa.

CONTROLLED BY ENGELHARD

Williams did not offer any additional information on the companies, but the New Jersey firm is headed and controlled by

Charles W. Engelhard, a personal and political associate of the President.

Engelhard, a multimillionaire who lives in Far Hills, N.J., accompanied Johnson on the President's around-the-world trip last December.

A White House spokesman said yesterday that Engelhard was "a friend of the President" and was taken on the trip "as a guest" of Johnson.

In October 1964, Engelhard was named by Johnson to head this country's delegation attending the Zambia independence celebration.

Engelhard also has been a member of the United States delegations to the coronation of Pope Paul VI, Gabon's independence ceremonies and Algeria's first anniversary celebration.

Engelhard, a heavy contributor to the Democratic party for many years, is a member of the New Jersey Democratic Committee and a trustee of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library.

The arrangement under which Williams said Engelhard's firm will make a "windfall" profit is being conducted in this manner:

Platinum, a rare and valuable metal, is one of a number of commodities which the federal government maintains in a "national stockpile."

The "stockpile objective" or maximum amount of platinum the government believes it necessary to own is 335,000 troy ounces, but as of December 1966, there were 450,000 troy ounces on hand.

The government plans to sell the excess 115,000 troy ounces, a move with which Williams says he agrees, but he said the pending bill represented a "planned giveaway" because of the price involved.

The two companies "will not be permitted to retain all of this \$12 million windfall," Williams said, because they and the government have agreed on a formula under which both the platinum and any profits will be divided with a number of other firms.

"The administration's plan is to negotiate this sale at a price ranging between \$109 to \$112 per unit. This compares with a quoted market price of platinum at \$214 per unit," Williams said yesterday.

"By selling at competitive bids, the government would realize approximately \$12 million more," he said. "Why should the government not sell to the highest bidder?"

A spokesman for the General Services Administration (GSA), asked yesterday about Williams' charges, said no price has yet been set for the platinum because the authority to sell has not been granted by Congress.

The GSA official said 316,000 troy ounces of platinum were sold through negotiation in 1966 to the same two firms. At a January 1967 meeting, officials of the government and the companies agreed on the new sale under the same conditions, he said.

The GSA official said he had "no knowledge" of pressure from the White House to carry out the sale, but other sources said the decision was made "quite high up in the administration."

Engelhard, who was not immediately available for comment, is board chairman of the Newark firm, which had net sales of \$288 million in 1966 and current assets of \$295 million at that time.

He controls the manufacturing firm through a personal holding company, Engelhard Hanovia, Inc., whose 47 percent of the stock in the Engelhard Minerals and Chemicals Corp. is valued at more than \$250 million.

LINKS TO SOUTH AFRICA

In addition, Engelhard is the principal owner of Rand Mines, Ltd., the second largest gold mining firm in South Africa, accounting for 23 percent of that nation's gold production. The firm employs about 100,000 native South African workers.

Engelhard holds a seat on that nation's Chamber of Mines, which is responsible for production decisions, and on two subsidiary boards which recruit employees for the country's mining operations.

It is in that capacity that he has been the subject of frequent criticism from those who charge that his official position and the large holdings in South African mining operations to supply precious metals for his worldwide investments have made Engelhard a supporter of that country's white supremacist government.

When Johnson named Engelhard as his personal and official representative to the Zambia ceremonies, the selection was criticized by a South African leader who described the businessman as "the financier of apartheid."

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 13, 1968]

SENATOR WILLIAMS THROWS A BLOCK: PLATINUM DEAL WOULD ENRICH L. B. J. PAL

(By Dan Thomasson)

A company owned by a close friend of President Johnson stands to become a beneficiary of a platinum deal Sen. John J. Williams (R., Del.) charges would cost the Government \$12 million.

Sen. Williams today identified the company as Engelhard Minerals and Chemicals Corp. of Newark, N.J., owned by "platinum king" Charles W. Engelhard Jr. Mr. Engelhard and his wife accompanied the President as guests on his around-the-world trip last December. Mr. Engelhard also has been a prominent figure in national Democratic Party circles.

Sen. Williams said the Administration is seeking Congressional approval to "negotiate" the sale of platinum from the U.S. stockpile at more than \$100 a troy ounce below the market price.

IT'S A FARCE

He charged the House-passed bill to permit the negotiation is a "farce" since arrangements already have been made to channel the platinum thru the Engelhard company and Matthey Bishop Inc. of Malvern, Pa.

Engelhard and Matthey Bishop, he said, will not retain all the "windfall" but have agreed to pass on at the negotiated price part of the platinum to other firms in the industry.

But Sen. Williams said today he plans to offer an amendment which would put the platinum up for sale on a competitive-bid basis. He charged, however, that to counter this the Administration may ask that the bill be left to die on the Senate calendar where it has been pending for some time.

Sen. Williams said the report on the bill from the House Armed Services Committee confirms that the Administration plans to negotiate the sale of the platinum at a price between \$109 and \$112 an ounce. He said this compares with a quoted market price of \$214 an ounce.

REALIZE \$12 MILLION

Sen. Williams charged the Government could realize \$12 million more from the sale of the platinum by putting it up for competitive bids. He called the present Administration plan a "giveaway."

"Certainly our Government, which already is operating at a deficit of nearly \$2 billion per month, can find a use for this \$12 million," he said.

The General Services Administration, which controls stockpiled minerals, said the negotiated sale plans were formulated last year at an industry-wide meeting.

The agency said it was the "consensus" of the industry members the sale should be handled in this fashion with the distribution handled by the two major producers and refiners.

A FACT OF LIFE

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1968 issue of the NFO Reporter, the official publication of the National Farmers Organization, there appears an editorial entitled "A Fact of Life," which I feel sure deserves the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

In the masthead of the Reporter the basic philosophy of the NFO is set out in the words, "A healthy agriculture, a prosperous country, to this end we are sincerely dedicated."

From a standpoint of either logic or ordinary commonsense, it would seem to be almost irrefutable that a healthy agriculture is prerequisite to, or better stated, the foundation of, a prosperous country.

All of us have now been exposed to the content and conclusions of the Kerner report, being the findings of the President's Commission on Riots. I suppose it was intended to shock the national conscience. In some measure it may have succeeded. Perhaps we need a Presidential Commission to shock the conscience of this country on the inconceivable situation of the American farmer who is today receiving less for his product than he was 20 years ago—notwithstanding mounting operating and living costs.

While I cannot be in agreement with all of the content of the Kerner report, one of its conclusions was that the problems of the cities may have to be solved in rural America. They meant, of course, that some way must be found to restrain or limit the outmigration of those thousands and thousands of rural residents who year after year further congest our cities and add to the problems of megapolopolis. Whether we call it rural renewal, rural rejuvenation, or by whatever the description, some way must be found to make it possible for the small farmer to receive comparative income with his city brothers so that he will remain in the rural area and thus not add to the already insurmountable problems of the cities.

The National Farmers Organization was among the first to argue that collective bargaining is the answer to the so-called farm problem because it will enable the farmer to put a price tag on his products like other segments of the business community. The following editorial contains some pretty strong language, but on the whole is an accurate description of the struggle of the National Farmers Organization for the good of its membership and indirectly for the good of every American farmer.

The editorial follows:

A FACT OF LIFE

It is a brutal fact of life that the NFO and its members today, right this very min-

ute, are locked in a death struggle for the very existence of the American farmer.

And against unbelievable odds. The man who feeds his country—and many others—so well, is going it alone. This is it—blunt and hardnosed.

Never in the history of this country has there been such a battle against overwhelming odds. As if the struggle for the survival of the American agricultural community was not enough, the NFO and its dedicated members are being jabbed and gouged from all sides.

How many packers, commission men or chain stores want the NFO to win this great economic struggle? How much of the communication media would lend a helping hand? Is government really sincere in its interest in the American farmer?

It is a fact of life that certain elements want American agriculture kept on its knees, a pawn at the mercy of the rest of the country—to be used and bled and bled again.

Oh, the surface talk sounds good—"We must do something towards better farm prices" or "The farmer should get better prices for his products".

But it is only lip service, to be read or heard once over lightly and then forgotten about when it comes to any action. "This will pacify him, just enough crumbs to keep him quiet" is the thinking.

The American farmer has something that no one else has—the soil and the tools and the knowledge to produce the world's greatest abundance of food. But he is expected to produce that food—while losing money, while groveling in a swamp of inferior living conditions, while being treated as a second class citizen.

It is inconceivable that this situation should exist in a country as great as ours. But it does.

The American farmer today is receiving less for his products than he did 20 years ago. And in that two-decade span his operating and living costs have mounted, just like they have for everyone else. Yet when the NFO and its members battle for fair prices for the American farmer they meet a stiff wall of opposition from all sides.

The present all-commodity holding action in which the NFO is engaged is a good example.

The only weapon that buyers in the present marketing system have is to make receipts look normal, to make it appear that the action is having no effect. It is easy to shuffle livestock from market to market, making receipts look good. But people can not eat receipt figures.

The purpose of these tactics, of course, is the attempt to demoralize farmers to the point where they think the holding action is having no effect. They want the farmer to lose hope and quit holding in the all-commodity action.

It also is a fact of life that the NFO has made tremendous headway in this hand-to-hand combat. It has emerged as the major farm organization, the only one willing to fight realistically for the American farmer.

It is doing what should have been done years ago—it is offering the structure and the tools of collective bargaining, which will enable the farmer to put a price tag on his products just as done by all other segments of the business community.

NFO image and acceptance are growing and expanding—despite the overwhelming odds. Great strides are being made in the all-commodity holding action. Membership is growing by leaps and bounds, rural business men are becoming more aware of the great need for NFO to win.

We all realize the battle we are up against. We realize, too, that as farmers we are practically alone in this battle.

There are many hopeful signs from the long, hard struggle and sacrifices that lie

behind us. And there are more rugged mountains ahead before the battle is won. But NFO and its members are determined and dedicated and sure of success. Because what they are doing is right, moral and just.

Don't forget for one second, for one minute—Only the NFO and its members will get the job done. There will be little help, little encouragement. This is a fact of life.

Tighten down. You own the food. Refuse to sell until we have contracts and prices.

And it is likely when historians chronicle the events of the 20th Century they will not overlook what the NFO and its gallant members did in protecting the American way of life against almost insurmountable odds.

FEDERAL CODE TAKEOVER: NEEDLESS POWER GRAB

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, during August of 1966, I had the privilege to address the 29th convention of the United Association of Plumbers & Pipefitters in Kansas City, Mo. At that time, I was highly gratified by the enthusiastic response of the delegates to the views I expressed on the subject of a national building code and national plumbing code. What I said was that our city and county—and in some cases, State—governments had more than amply established their competence in this field, and that national legislation was uncalled for.

Subsequently, the convention passed a unanimous resolution opposing all uniform and model plumbing codes and all efforts to develop such codes.

Just recently, Mr. Peter T. Schoemann, the general president of that same international union, has published in the *UA Journal* for February 1968 an article entitled "Federal Code Takeover: Needless Power Grab." Mr. Schoemann refers to sections in two bills, H.R. 12142 and H.R. 12401, which would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to draft a model building code. He refers also to four privately sponsored model plumbing codes. He points out that these private codes become in effect quasi-Federal codes when HUD threatens to withhold loans or grants in order to force a local government to adopt one or other of those codes.

Mr. Schoemann contends that this country does not need a Federal or quasi-Federal plumbing code. He makes one other very interesting point, which I believe it would be well for this distinguished body to heed; namely, whether an executive agency writes the code or enforces a code written by a private association, in either case there is an improper delegation of the legislative authority of Congress.

A plumbing code is a statute, a piece of legislation. If there is truly a need for a Federal plumbing code, then that code should be considered and debated and enacted in its entirety by the only law-making organ of the Federal Government, the Congress of the United States. The lawmaking process does not belong

in an executive department or on the convention floor of a private code writing organization. If and when a national plumbing code is needed, it will be the job of Congress to write it.

The article follows:

FEDERAL CODE TAKEOVER: NEEDLESS POWER GRAB

What enormous changes a few years have brought on the plumbing code front!

Today, the local plumbing code threatens to become as outdated as the passenger train, if not as extinct as the passenger pigeon. We could continue to have local plumbing codes in form for many years to come, but—if present trends continue—the substance of this function of government will most likely be carried on in the offices of various Federal agencies, especially the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and in the meeting rooms of private code-making bodies.

A sign of the changing times was the decision last month of the Bituminous Pipe Institute to terminate its field staff. BPI said the day of the individual municipal plumbing code seems to be on the wane while regional and national authorities are gaining in importance.

What then are these regional and national codes? There are four:

1. National Plumbing Code of the United States of America Standards Institute (USASI).

2. Basic Plumbing Code of the Building Officials Conference of America (BOCA).

3. Uniform Plumbing Code of the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials (IAPMO), formerly the Western Plumbing Officials Association.

4. Part III, plumbing of the southern standard building code, a project of the Southern Building Code Congress (SBCC).

To top it all off, Representative Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.) and some twenty other Congressmen have introduced H.R. 12142 and H.R. 12401, providing for what could truly be called a Federal plumbing code. Title VIII of the proposed act reads:

"Sec. 801. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, within one year after enactment of this act, develop and publish in the Federal Register a model building code which will permit the use of modern architectural and engineering techniques and practices to facilitate the construction of housing at reasonable cost. The Secretary shall develop and issue revisions of this code from time to time to keep it abreast of continuing technological development.

(b) No program of subsidy, aid, or assistance by any agency of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (including but not limited to sewer and water facility grants, open space grants, community facilities grants, urban renewal programs, and Federal Housing Administration insurance) may be carried on within any jurisdiction within which the model building code (including any revision thereof) published by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, is not in effect within three years after its publication."

The term "building code" as used in the industry may or may not include the plumbing code. If Congress were ever to pass the above-quoted section, there is no doubt that it would be interpreted to include all mechanical codes.

Purpose behind the proposal is to facilitate construction of low-cost housing for the poor.

Certainly everything we mean by "model cities"—not only the act by that name, but the whole approach to the solution of city problems—constitutes probably the gravest challenge we have ever faced. It could mean greater prosperity in a more prosperous country, or it could mean the end of the line.

As G. W. Bambrough put it recently in the *RPA Journal*, a British publication:

"As we enter the plastic age, one wonders whether the plumber as such may eventually lose his identity, bearing in mind the name was derived from the Latin 'worker in lead'. It must certainly be beyond the imagination of our most fervent craftsmen to hope that the old skills associated with the plumbing industry will remain much longer."

Two things are certain so far as Federal pre-emption of the plumbing code field are concerned:

(1) The range of Federal control ought not to exceed the limit of the Federal largesse, and (2) we should be able to solve our pressing domestic social problems without overturning structures and institutions that have worked for the great majority of our people.

Not long ago, when we were trying to get a Federal school aid bill through Congress, there was a great amount of wasted debate over whether Federal control would follow the Federal dollar. I recall an occasion when, testifying for the AFL-CIO in favor of a Federal aid bill, I was asked whether Federal control would not follow the Federal dollar. Many on our side were appalled when I replied that of course it would.

When the Federal Government sets about passing out money for urban renewal or model cities, there is no future in trying to say that Federal control should not follow the Federal dollar. There is some point in saying that it ought not to gallop out ahead of the Federal dollar, if there is any merit at all in retaining a measure of State and local government on the American scene. The present habit of HUD is to require—and this is in the Reuss bill also—adoption of a federally favored code for the entire city. This is Federal interference gone stark raving mad. An urban renewal project does not cover an entire city. Nor do all the citizens of a prosperous American city require special breaks in order to acquire decent housing, to say nothing of commercial and industrial construction.

As a matter of fact, if ever a nation in the history of the world was adequately equipped to solve its domestic social problems without disrupting its whole social fabric, that nation ought to be the United States of America at the present time. We have a serious racial minority problem. The most numerous racial minority comprises less than 11 percent of our total population. What about the other 89 percent? We have a serious unemployment problem in the so-called ghettos. The most recent estimate of our national unemployment rate was 3.5 percent. What about the 96.5 percent who are employed?

We are not a poor little developing nation where the top five percent live in luxury and the other 95 percent in squalor. Whatever may be the need for sweeping social change in such countries, there is most assuredly none at present in the U.S.A. Help for the poor there must be, but so also must there be sanity and a sense of proportion and a decent regard for the institutions that support our prosperity.

Even granting that cheap housing will solve a major human problem for thousands of disadvantaged persons living in ghettos—which is by no means self-evident—and even granting that the new cheap housing of today will not become the new slums of tomorrow—which is by no means self-evident—there is still no reason whatsoever why any domestic problem this nation faces cries out for effective control over plumbing codes to be transferred from city hall to Washington. Rather the exact opposite is the case. The plumbing code as it presently exists is one element in a construction industry and a construction performance of which, when compared with other nations having more centralized control, this nation can be justly proud.

Cheap housing for the poor should not lead to a cheapening of the whole community. America wasn't built on cheap housing and "anything goes" plumbing codes.

If there must be a Federal or quasi-Federal plumbing code, its application should be strictly limited to those projects for which Uncle Sam picks up all or most of the tab. Otherwise, our jovial Uncle Sam becomes just a meddlesome mother-in-law.

What Mr. REUSS is really proposing amounts to an improper delegation of legislative authority to an agency of the Executive branch.

What is going on at the present time is even worse—an improper delegation of legislative authority, through HUD, to the various private code-making bodies. These bodies then become private repositories of a public trust. For example, in the case of BOCA, the function which ought to be performed by Congress will be performed by a group of local building officials gathered together in a private convention. This is not taking the plumbing code out of politics. It is taking it out of the rightful home of validly constituted lawmaking process, whether Congress or city hall, and transferring it to a private convention floor (and also to the lobbies and hospitality suites nearby) where you find the same pressures of money and power, but not the same safeguards of due process found in honest government. Voting delegates to these code-making bodies are not, either individually or as a group, politically responsible to the same constituency that will be affected by their actions.

The titanic economic and social forces which have become engaged in the plumbing code argument do not belong in the convention halls of private organizations, and the public interest cannot afford to buy a result that is fashioned there. Neither is the public interest really protected when the code writing job is delegated to the dark corridors of HUD or some other Federal agency, where lobbyists ply their trade without the protection even of the Lobbying Act.

If there is really a need for a Federal plumbing code, then that code must be enacted by Congress—not by an executive agency or private association—and the strict limits of its application must be the substantial influence of the Federal dollar.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the President's message on "The Nation's First City."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. PURCELL), for the balance of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. MAILLIARD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of March 11, 1968, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HUNGATE, for 1 hour, on March 18;

to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE), for 1 hour, on March 18; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. WYATT), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 10 minutes, today. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. TUNNEY, for 30 minutes, on March 27.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. NEDZI in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI in three instances.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. RYAN in three instances.

Mr. CORBETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WYATT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HARRISON in two instances.

Mr. SCHERLE.

Mr. ROTH in five instances.

Mr. BRAY in four instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. SNYDER in three instances.

Mr. CURTIS in three instances.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. LUKENS.

Mr. PIRNIE.

Mr. KUPFERMAN in 5 instances.

Mr. McCLURE.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. GOODELL in five instances.

Mr. RUPPE.

Mrs. DWYER in two instances.

Mr. ADAIR.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. KLEPPE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. OTTINGER in four instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland.

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in three instances.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. MATSUNAGA in four instances.
 Mr. BROWN of California.
 Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
 Mr. DULSKI in three instances.
 Mr. CAREY in two instances.
 Mr. ANNUNZIO.
 Mr. MOSS in two instances.
 Mr. CLARK in two instances.
 Mr. PATTEN in two instances.
 Mr. RARICK in two instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
 Mr. NICHOLS.
 Mr. FASCELL in three instances.
 Mr. REES in two instances.
 Mr. FLOOD in two instances.
 Mr. RIVERS in two instances.
 Mr. JACOBS.
 Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
 Mr. TENZER.
 Mr. RESNICK in two instances.
 Mr. KASTENMEIER.
 Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.
 Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.
 Mr. OLSEN in two instances.
 Mr. ADAMS.
 Mr. BENNETT in three instances.
 Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.
 The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1636. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1967, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 282); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.
 1637. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Naval Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1) and to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1638. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the economic study of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Installment Credit and Retail Sales Practices of the District of Columbia Retailers"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1639. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of actions taken to improve the Government's methods for evaluating vehicle use and for estimating vehicle needs, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1640. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 2 years the program of research and development undertaken by the Secretary of Transportation in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1641. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and foster joint rates

for international transportation of property, to facilitate the transportation of such property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1642. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 55th Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 604; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1643. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for loans to public bodies which upon sale by the Farmers Home Administration shall bear taxable interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 14681. A bill to declare a portion of Boston Inner Harbor and Fort Point Channel nonnavigable; with amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1027. Resolution providing for the expense of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1045. Resolution to provide funds for the further expenses for the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 312 (Rept. No. 1169). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1042. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10477. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase the amount of home loan guarantee entitlement from \$7,500 to \$10,000, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1094. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 13541, a bill to prohibit unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1095. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 15224, a bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 1173). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1096. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 15364, a bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 15710. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make the exemption from the prohibition against participation in political activities applicable to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the members of the District of Columbia Council (Rept. No. 1175). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 15923. A bill to provide for the cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the States with respect to the future regulation of surface mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 15924. A bill to amend the act of December 11, 1963 (77 Stat. 349); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 15925. A bill to provide special encouragement to veterans to pursue a public service career in deprived areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 15926. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit funds in custodial accounts treated as qualified pension trusts to be invested in stock of closed-end regulated investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 15927. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 15928. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 15929. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 15930. A bill to amend section 212(a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLURE:

H.R. 15931. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with a supplementary loan to the King Hill Irrigation District, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 15932. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit State taxation of the carriage of persons in air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15933. A bill to provide for the prototype construction of a commercial supersonic transport airplane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 15934. A bill to facilitate equipment interchange between and among the several modes of transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15935. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for disciplinary action against employees in the postal field service who assault other employees in such service in the performance of official duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 15936. A bill to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 15937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 15938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 15939. A bill to amend section 8c(2) (A) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to include Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico among the specified States which are eligible to participate in marketing agreement and order programs with respect to apples; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 15940. A bill to impose, under certain conditions, import limitations on metal ores or metals during labor disputes affecting domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. OTTINGER):

H.R. 15941. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to assure all recipients of such assistance (in conjunction with recent social security benefit increases) an average increase of \$7.50 in the total amount of their income from such assistance and other sources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 15942. A bill to impose, under certain conditions, import limitations on metal ores or metals during labor disputes affecting domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 15943. A bill to impose, under certain conditions, import limitations on metal ores or metals during labor disputes affecting domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 15944. A bill making a supplemental appropriation to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 15945. A bill to impose, under certain conditions, import limitations on metal ores or metals during labor disputes affecting domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 15946. A bill making a supplemental appropriation to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 15947. A bill making it a felony to carry or attempt to carry firearms or explosives on board commercial aircraft and to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require additional precautionary measures aboard aircraft in the interest of the safety of the traveling public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 15948. A bill to require the Secretary of the Navy to retrocede certain jurisdiction with respect to the Dahlgren Naval Weapons Laboratory; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 15949. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 15950. A bill to extend until June 30, 1970, the period for compliance with certain

safety standards in the case of passenger vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLODY (for himself, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. McCULLOCH, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. TENZER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. ANNUNZIO):

H.R. 15951. A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain legal public holidays on Mondays, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 1162. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of the President to dispatch the Armed Forces of the United States outside of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.J. Res. 1163. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the use of the United States mails for the transmission of communications hostile to the Constitution, laws, and form of government of the United States or any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 1164. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 1165. Joint resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.J. Res. 1166. Joint resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.J. Res. 1167. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as Family Reunion Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 1168. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week beginning with the Sunday immediately following Easter Sunday of each year as National Credit Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.J. Res. 1169. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week beginning with the Sunday immediately following Easter Sunday of each year as National Credit Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.J. Res. 1170. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.J. Res. 1171. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. Con. Res. 685. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 686. Concurrent resolution to require France to pay its World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Con. Res. 687. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the level

of U.S. forces should not be increased in Vietnam without the explicit consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Con. Res. 688. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not increase its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 689. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the settlement of the indebtedness of the French Republic to the United States made by the World War Foreign Debt Commission and approved by the President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. Con. Res. 690. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service relating to elimination of tax exemptions on interest paid on industrial bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H. Con. Res. 691. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 1097. Resolution concerning investigation of development lending in Latin America and in Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

318. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to payment by the Government of all expenses incurred by members of the medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

319. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to including a cost of living formula in the method of computing payments under social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15952. A bill for the relief of Paul Hyppolite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15953. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Novelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15954. A bill for the relief of Shun Chun Fat also known as Shum Chun Fat Sang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 15955. A bill for the relief of H. A. Parr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 15956. A bill for the relief of James Hideaki Buck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15957. A bill for the relief of Generoso D. Duremdes, M.D., his wife Janelle B. Duremdes, M.D., and their minor child Gene Duremdes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 15958. A bill for the relief of Lincoln Joseph Barrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 15959. A bill for the relief of Caterina Scafuro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:
H.R. 15960. A bill for the relief of Khazan Agrawal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:
H.R. 15961. A bill for the relief of Mario de Silva Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15962. A bill for the relief of Esther and Albert Yehros and their minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15963. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Montelro Fontes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:
H.R. 15964. A bill for the relief of Elbert M. Crofoot and Roberta Crofoot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:
H.R. 15965. A bill for the relief of Luigi Piscitelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:
H.R. 15966. A bill for the relief of Sina Fallahi Oskoui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15967. A bill for the relief of Marc Mardoché Serfaty, his wife, Hilda Serfaty, and their son, Anthony Sebastian Serfaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:
H.R. 15968. A bill for the relief of Naomi Watkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:
H.R. 15969. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4 Klaus Josef Strauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:
H. Res. 1098. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 1624) entitled "A bill for the relief of Sherman Webb, and others" to the Chief

Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

261. By Mr. DORN: Petition of the citizens of the United States, relative to trading with the enemy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

262. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Karoly Cillanyi, Budapest, Hungary, relative to reimbursement for services rendered; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Wednesday, March 13, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father: Thou searcher of men's hearts, and who desirest truth in the inward parts, help us in this opening moment of a new day's council, to draw near to Thee in tranquillity, humility, and sincerity.

Again in Thy mercy we kneel at this altar of Thy grace with the sure confidence of Thy servant of old, as he poured out his soul, declaring "at noon, I will pray and call aloud and the Lord shall hear my voice."

To Thee we lift our hearts, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite spirits. From Thy hands we have received the gift of life, the blessings of home and of friendship, and the sacrament of beauty. In the fullness of Thy mercy Thou hast given us work to do and the strength wherewith to do it.

May we walk with Thee in the bright fellowship of those who are able to say at the last—I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith.

We ask it in that Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 12, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the

President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14910) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, import, sale, shipment, or use of devices which cause harmful interference to radio reception.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 14910) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, import, sale, shipment, or use of devices which cause harmful interference to radio reception, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CERTAIN AID UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1968

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on certain aid under the Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Railroad Retirement Board for "Limitation on salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1968, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report to the Congress for the period ended December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT COMPETITIVE BIDDING

A letter from the Assistant Commander for Contracts, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual report covering contracts awarded on other than a competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder, for the period ended December 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED PESTICIDE LEGISLATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the act of August 1, 1958, as amended, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 55th annual report of the Secretary for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an